WITHDRAWN

ACCESSION NUMBER 58049

SHELF NUMBER HT421 A5 9th

The Virginia Library

McCormick
Theological Seminary
of the
Presbyterian Church, Chicago
825 Belden Avenue

From

Received Jan. 1928

Conference Delegates Who Visited Mount Vernon to Place a Wreath on the Tomb of George Washington, One of the Foremost Agriculturists of His Day.

FARM YOUTH

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
NINTH NATIONAL COUNTRY
LIFE CONFERENCE

American country life conferen

Washington, D. C.
1926

WITHDRAWN

PUBLISHED BY
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
FOR THE
AMERICAN COUNTRY LIFE ASSOCIATION
1849 Grand Central Terminal
NEW YORK CITY

McCORMICK THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY LIBRARY,
CHICAGO

Copyright, 1927
By the American Country Life Association

All Rights Reserved

Published, May, 1927

HWARCHTIW

Composed and Printed by
J. J. Little & Ives Company
New York, U. S. A.

409
A512

FOREWORD

This volume contains the proceedings of the Ninth National Country Life Conference held in Washington, D. C., November 10-13, 1926, upon the topic "Farm Youth."

Part I contains papers and addresses delivered at various sessions of the Conference. Limitations of space have prevented the publishing of all papers.

Part II contains the record of the three full sessions of the conference which were conducted by the discussion method. Space was not available for giving reports of the small groups into which the conference divided for two other sessions. The deliberations of the small groups were, however, reported back to the sessions which are recorded. A report of the Student Section is also given.

Part III contains reports of the American Country Life Association.

HENRY ISRAEL,
Executive Secretary.

New York City.

Zeigler A 1.63

CONTENTS

PART I. ADDRESSES AND PAPERS

	PAGE
The Special Needs of Farm Youth—William M. Jardine	3
Our Rural Youth—Presidential Address—Kenyon L. Butterfield	6
Objectives of Rural Education—John J. Tigert	10
Wanted: A Real Farm Bloc—Carl S. Vrooman	14
A Laboratory of Farm Life—Malcolm Dana, Jr.	17
As a Student Sees Farm Life—Laura Amos	20
The Intangibles in Farm Life—Paul Sanders	25
My Experience as a Farm Mother—Mrs. G. T. Powell	29
Europe's Farm Youth—C. J. Galpin	35
Some Conditions in Europe Affecting Farm Youth—A. R. Mann	37
Some Observations of Denmark—E. C. Lindeman	43
The Peasants of Russia—E. T. Colton	45
Rural Women of Europe—Grace Frysinger	49
The International Conference—1926—Kenyon L. Butterfield	52

PART II. THE DISCUSSION OF THE CONFERENCE

What Is the Situation Faced by Farm Youth?	59
What Are the Special Problems?	95
What Should Be Done?	111
Report of Student Section	137

PART III. REPORTS OF THE AMERICAN COUNTRY LIFE ASSOCIATION

Report of the Board of Directors of the American Country Life Association	143
Business Transacted during the Conference	146
Financial Statement	148
Committees of the Association	151

OFFICIALS OF THE AMERICAN COUNTRY LIFE ASSOCIATION

1927

OFFICERS

KENYON L. BUTTERFIELD, *President,* East Lansing, Michigan.
MRS. CHARLES C. SCHUTTLER, *First Vice-President,* Farmington, Missouri.
J. H. REYNOLDS, *Second Vice-President,* Guelph, Ontario, Canada.
CHARLES F. JENKINS, *Treasurer,* Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
HENRY ISRAEL, *Executive Secretary,* New York City.
MISS ROSALIND M. JEWETT, *Assistant Secretary,* New York City.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

One Year Term—Expiring November, 1927.

EDMUND DE S. BRUNNER, New York City.
NAT T. FRAME, Morgantown, West Virginia.
HUGH MCRAE, Wilmington, North Carolina.
E. L. MORGAN, Columbia, Missouri.
MRS. G. THOMAS POWELL, Glen Cove, New York.
C. C. TAYLOR, West Raleigh, North Carolina.
ALBERT SHAW, JR., New York City.

Two Year Term—Expiring November, 1928.

W. J. CAMPBELL, Springfield, Massachusetts.
MISS MABEL CARNEY, New York City.
E. C. LINDEMAN, Highbridge, New Jersey.
HENRY MORGENTHAU, JR., New York City.
J. B. REYNOLDS, Guelph, Ontario, Canada.
S. H. THOMPSON, Quincy, Illinois.
CARL S. VROOMAN, Bloomington, Illinois.

Three Year Term—Expiring November, 1929.

KENYON L. BUTTERFIELD, East Lansing, Michigan.
CHARLES F. JENKINS, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
FRANK O. LOWDEN, Oregon, Illinois.
EDWIN V. O'HARA, Eugene, Oregon.
MRS. CHARLES C. SCHUTTLER, Farmington, Missouri.
C. B. SMITH, Washington, D. C.
L. J. TABER, Columbus, Ohio.

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE

WILLIAM H. TUFTS, East Lansing, Michigan.

PART I

ADDRESSES AND PAPERS

McCORMICK THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY LIBRARY,
CHICAGO

FARM YOUTH

THE SPECIAL NEEDS OF FARM YOUTH

HON. WILLIAM M. JARDINE
Secretary of Agriculture

MR. CHAIRMAN, Ladies and Gentlemen of the American Country Life Association and Guests: It is very good that you decided to hold your annual session this year in the City of Washington. You are dealing with a question in which the workers in the Department of Agriculture are very much interested. We are curtailing traveling expenses a good deal these days, so you make it possible for us to be present in large numbers.

The American Country Life Association represents perhaps more variety of viewpoints and more catholicity of taste than any other organization dealing with agriculture or rural life. This is in itself a good thing. We need a society dedicated to pioneer thinking, as this organization is. Your work, I am confident, will give new meanings to life in the American countryside.

At this session of the Association you are taking up the problem of rural youth. This is a problem that will never be completely solved, for youth is always advancing and always offering new questions. I am sure, however, that you will be able to reach some significant conclusions which will be of great assistance to all who are concerned with agriculture and rural life in the years immediately to come.

The primary problem in this connection, as I see it, is not, as some have thought, that of insuring an increasing proportion of persons on American farms. The tendency of the nation in the direction of industry must be practically recognized. It is a situation

met by practically every nation in the course of its development. It means an increasing proportion of the population employed in industry rather than agriculture.

The meaning of this situation is that our future need is going to be not for an increased proportion of farmers to the rest of the population, but for farmers with greater ability to apply the results of research in the natural sciences of invention, and of economic and sociological analysis, to agriculture and rural life. We must get this personnel from the ranks of the youth now growing up.

I am by no means a believer exclusively in the economic side of life, but I am convinced that at the present time, so far as agriculture is concerned, stress needs to be laid on the economic problems that exist and the opportunities that these offer to young men and women who want to do something genuinely constructive. A reasonable economic return to the farmer is fundamental to the right type of rural life.

Along with this we should give boys and girls an understanding of modern marketing methods as applied to agricultural products. In particular, we should give them a thorough grasp of the methods and opportunities of the cooperative movement, for in this more than in any other one thing lies the future of American farming, and with it of Americal rural life. I should like to see a course in cooperation in every rural school in the United States. I should like to see every rural preacher and every officer of a rural life organization committed to cooperative principles. As we develop understanding of cooperation we are going to develop constantly stronger commodity cooperative organizations. These will have not only bargaining power. They will promote not only stabilization of the market for farm products but they will weld the farmers of the nation into a cohesive group concerned with the upbuilding of a sound, permanent rural civilization, as well as with the immediate economic betterment of the farmer.

The growth of cooperative marketing shows that, as a business method of distribution, it is peculiarly well adapted to the handling of farm products. It could not have grown and persisted as it has unless it possessed some well-defined advantages in the way of business organization and operation. No one will deny that a

movement of this magnitude, with its tremendous economic and social significance, must be analyzed and guided so that its highest possibilities may be realized. Actual experiences and methods evolved in the cooperative business need to be studied and explained in plain language in order that they may serve as guide-posts for the future. This the Department of Agriculture is now doing more thoroughly than ever before.

The application of better business methods in agriculture means more, in the final analysis, than merely helping the farmer to make more dollars and cents. We are interested in cooperative organization among farmers as it touches the daily life of the man, woman and child in the rural community. We are interested in a high type of rural civilization.

The young people now growing up should be prepared to take advantage of this opportunity, which will be of increasing importance as time goes on. The agricultural cooperatives today are marketing one-fifth of the agricultural products of the country. What will they be able to do with a growing body of young farmers and farm women understanding the movement and prepared to serve in it? What will this mean not only to the improvement of the farmer's economic position, but to the betterment of rural life as a whole?

It must be evident to you that my position with reference to the training of rural youth is not that we should endeavor to keep them on the farm on the stated ground that the farmers are the backbone of the nation, and that the country needs a strong farming group. These statements are true enough, but we are not going to be able to commit the best type of youth to rural life on this basis. The farmer, like the laborer, is worthy of his hire. The essential to a sound rural life is a body of youth adapted by ability and temperament to it, and trained in its economic possibilities and in the opportunity which the development of these affords to aspiring young people. Agriculture offers larger opportunities for leadership than it has ever offered before. These opportunities are not vague or elusive. They are calls to action in behalf of the sound economic policies which alone will yield a permanently satisfactory rural civilization.

OUR RURAL YOUTH

Dr. Kenyon L. Butterfield
President American Country Life Association

I have chosen for the subject of the presidential address the theme of the conference, "Our Rural Youth."

All youth are always significant. They test civilization both as fruitage of what has been and as seed of what may be. The twentieth century attends to the needs and potentialities of youth more fully and more intelligently than has any preceding century. But the youth problem is as old as humanity, as urgent as the pulsing blood of young men and maidens, as timeless as the race itself. The oldest human problem and the newest is the problem of youth.

We are met to consider the problems of that group of American youth who dwell in the open spaces, on farms and in villages, our rural youth. There are seven millions of them, if we take the ages fourteen to twenty to signify youth, one-half of all American youth. Three millions of them are in school, four millions are not in school. Their distinctive environment, the special needs of institutions that serve them, the best methods of influencing and guiding them, are sufficient excuse for a conference program. Our rural youth unquestionably contain the overwhelmingly major part of the farmers of the next generation, as well as a substantial proportion of its urban leadership. What they are and are not, what they have and have not, in talent and opportunity, how they may be aided, are questions of prime importance. We are dealing with no minor issue, but with a vital phase of American life.

I wish to call atention to certain principles which I regard as of real consequence in any constructive program of guidance to the rural youth of America. Our helpfulness to rural youth is by no means confined to what is taught to them either formally or in-

formally in the school. Yet if we define the act of teaching broadly enough, we shall probably conclude that teaching and the teacher form the core of our talk and our activity in being of use to rural youth. So I ask you to think with me for a little time about some items that ought not to be omitted in the teaching program.

I. I call attention, first of all, to the need of giving our rural youth, both boys and girls, sound notions of the fundamental economic and social questions involved in agriculture. There is no need of pressing the argument for the significance of these questions. In these aspects of the rural problem, both agricultural colleges and public men have followed the lead of the farmers in recognizing that bountiful production is but the beginning of farming.

The present drift of thought and action relative to the rural problem is toward the correlation of effort in terms of certain units such as the home, the farm, the commodity, the community, the area about a large market, the producing region or "belt," the country as a whole, even the world—and all this quite in addition to unities represented in formal associations of various sorts. Now the concept of unity, the idea of collective and cooperative method among farmers, and more than all, the development of the cooperative spirit and attitude—these can all be imparted to rural youth.

Of all of these various unities, I should myself stress three. First, the farm (and for girls the farm home as well) as a unit of management or administration. A second significant unit is the commodity. A third unit, and the one I confess that I think is more nearly fundamental than any other that can be mentioned, is that of the local community.

I think there is one thing to be remembered in the education of youth, namely, that back of every issue there lies not only science—fact and principle and technic—but also an idea. One doesn't need to be a scientist or even to have a formal course in science to believe in evolution; nor to make a life-long study of politics and government to believe in democracy; nor to be a theologian in order to be religious. Indeed, I conceive it to be the task of education in a democratic society, to so inculcate fundamental concepts that they are part of the popular intellectual stock in trade, are in the very atmosphere we breathe.

II. A second item that should be emphasized in the education of rural youth is the best possible use of leisure. It is not so much of a joke to use the word leisure in regard to farmers and farming as it was a generation ago. But perhaps instead of urging a certain use of leisure, what we should do is rather to urge such use of time as provides both for relaxation and recreation, and for reflective thinking. Educationally the great American problem, with all classes and groups, is the difficulty of gaining the habit of taking time to think and of using time for reflective thinking. What do we mean by reflective thinking? Reflection about what? Well, for one thing, about the meaning of life. There is all the difference in the world between a life that has no meaning or purpose, and one that is governed by at least some sort of philosophy. What does work mean? Is it a drudgery, a compulsory servitude to a taskmaster, or is it opportunity both for service and for personal growth? Here is an absolutely vital distinction too seldom made clear to our youth. What is the meaning of citizenship?

III. Another service that can be rendered our youth in larger measure is the inspiration for farm careers. The business of farming is too often laid before youth simply from the angle of the encouraging or the discouraging side of a narrow economic interest. It is sometimes said that there is no chance for a career on the farm. It is not true. Given good land and a reasonable amount of capital, a fair economic basis can be assured, and on this basis the opportunities for community and even wider leadership and influence are sufficient to challenge the ambition of young people of ability. Neither agricultural colleges and schools nor legislation can save agriculture unless the business and life of the farm develop native leadership.

IV. We are entering upon an era when racial conflicts and national competitions, more particularly in the economic field, are more serious than ever before, and very largely because communication has crowded races and nations together and revealed all sorts of prejudices and competing ambitions. The only way out of this sharpened conflict is cooperation. Unquestionably, the farmers of America will have an increasing self-consciousness, will be obliged to organize more effectively than ever before, and may even be compelled to

maintain a political farm bloc. All this is often deprecated, yet it may be necessary for class protection. But it would be a pitiful situation if that were the end. The apparent antagonism between labor and agriculture, between consumers and producers, between urban and rural, must melt into deeper understanding and closer affiliation. What is true of the farmers as a class should be true also of racial relations within our own country and of international relations as well. Here again, it is vital that rural youth be wisely and fairly taught with respect to such problems as world peace, economic adjustments between classes and nations, the terms on which people can better live together in a crowded world, proper relationships between rural and urban interests. All depends upon attitude, spirit, point of view, and these can be imparted to rural youth.

V. Most of the suggestions that I have made can be dealt with in our schools. It is highly important that the right start be given in school. But they must also be dealt with in a systematic and attractive method of continuing education. It is quite as important to seek definitely and deliberately and persistently to educate the four million youth out of school as it is to educate the three million youth in school. In fact, there are still other millions of younger farmers and their wives who, for one reason or other, have not quite established themselves in the associations of adult life and who must also be reached. There are possibly five or six millions of people living under rural conditions, between the ages of say, fifteen and twenty-five, who are out of school forever and yet who ought to be steadily growing, expanding, enlarging, perpetually getting educated. It is a gigantic, difficult, complex problem, one of the great educational problems of our generation.

VI. I cannot leave this group of suggestions without adding another that involves us at once in many debatable questions and may easily lead us into sharp differences of opinion. We shall be untrue to rural youth unless we give them the best we have in religious education. What we are doing for them now in this respect is pitifully meager and inadequate, oftentimes one-sided, and even unchristian.

OBJECTIVES OF RURAL EDUCATION

JOHN J. TIGERT
United States Commissioner of Education

IN 1820, 87 per cent of all persons gainfully employed in this country were engaged in agriculture. In 1920, this percentage had been reduced to 26. Stated differently, in 1820, 87 per cent of productive effort was directed toward the production of the raw materials of food, clothing, and shelter. In 1920, we had released two of three men engaged in producing agricultural commodities, for productive effort in non-extractive industries, and though we have done this we produce sufficient for our own needs and remain the world's greatest exporter of agricultural commodities. We have been able to do this because our agricultural workers, while comprising less than four per cent of the world's total, produce approximately 25 per cent of the world's supply of cereal crops which constitute the bulk of the world's supply of agricultural commodities. The American farmer therefore produces more than six times as much per worker as the farmer of the world outside the United States.

Because of this increased efficiency in production we have not lost relative producing power in the United States although the percentage of workers who are engaged in agriculture has been reduced. In fact, if the process of population away from the farm were hastened rather than retarded the economic position of the farmer would undoubtedly be strengthened with no resulting danger to the nation. There seems, on the whole, scant need for indoctrination of farm youth so as to create a bias toward the farm on the score of national need for additional supplies of agricultural commodities. Let us consider, therefore, the bearing of this indoctrination for farm life policy on the purpose for which the public school was created:

(1) The essence of this philosophy contemplates occupational predestination and is in fundamental conflict with our ideal of a

social order. Our democracy is peopled largely by emigrants from older world states where freedom of occupational choice was in varying degrees denied. They migrated as a protest against such an order. In the United States the ceaseless shifting of our native population from community to community, from city to city, and state to state has been prompted largely by the search for better occupational opportunity. We must, however, concern ourselves with preventing occupational misfits through a policy of guidance to intelligent free occupational choice. This implies that farm children, as other children, shall first be taught the characteristics of a variety of occupations, that they be caused to test their abilities to do specific things required in different occupations, that they be taught the ways and the requirements for entrance into different occupations.

We must see to it, too, that every child acquires, to the limit of his ability, facility in the use of those tools which are fundamental to human social intercourse. Facility in the use of the fundamental tools of language and number are the chief means of occupational freedom. These are common tools of all occupations. These are the tools which make shifting from occupation to occupation as one succeeds possible. The acquisition of mere mechanical skills tends to fix the status of the worker. Vocational education in America must develop an adaptable worker and not an automaton. Accordingly we must not make education narrowly vocational too early, and we must not stress too much the skill side of highly specialized jobs at any time. We are to help children to find themselves vocationally and give to them the means of climbing the occupational ladder as universally creative qualities are evidenced and recognized by those who need workers.

(2) A further characteristic of this indoctrination policy is the intent and tendency through education to create class prejudices and align the farm group against other social groups. Unfortunately, specialization in industry and consequent specialization in labor exerts a powerful pull against a sense of social solidarity. More unfortunate yet, vocational groups have organized ostensibly for purposes of more intimate group cooperation, but the purposes of organization are being perverted to the end of using government for

group advantage and social exploitation. Government by majorities becomes impossible under such a regime and democracy disappears from the land.

There is a general danger that specialization in education corresponding to vocational specialization will contribute to social disintegration. Public education in general has recognized the danger and seeks to lay a basis for social solidarity through a common education extending through the elementary and junior high school periods, and by requiring even in specializing senior high school curricula a considerable amount of common educational experiences gained through English, the social studies, the fine arts and through socializing extra-curricular activities.

Ignoring this generally accepted principle of curriculum administration, those who have become alarmed at the trends of rural life and have forgotten the general purpose of public education have sought to vocationalize even the elementary school curriculum of farm youth. But the road to the qualification of farm youth for the largest possible service as citizens of the United States does not lie in that direction.

The farm youth will be best qualified for citizenship through an educational process that gives him mastery of the tools of learning; a knowledge of his true relation to the various groups which make up the world social order and a knowledge of the interdependence of social and occupational groups; a knowledge of the real possibilities and requirements in the major groups of occupations through which men serve and gain a livelihood, and an opportunity to test his ability and congeniality for characteristic tasks in these occupations; freedom to choose his field of service and opportunity for efficient training through a school curriculum that specifically relates to its chosen field of service; knowledge that functions in physical efficiency and habits that conserve health; moral courage that comes of understanding, physical vigor and a feeling of self-reliance that comes through such guidance that successful mastery of problems becomes habitual. Restrict him through interior training, through a prematurely specialized training, through a distortion of the facts of life in our social order and you deny him individual opportunity to achieve, you make him suspicious through ignorance, you make

him discontented and therefore a potential social danger, and you deny to the nation, with no gain to the group into which he happened to be born, a portion of the genius to which it has first claim. Deny him these things through inequality of educational opportunity and you pervert the institution we have set up as an agency of democracy to the uses of suppression of individual freedom.

WANTED: A REAL FARM BLOC!

CARL S. VROOMAN
Former Assistant Secretary of Agriculture

DURING the past five years the farmers vainly have been demanding relief from a situation which, according to the federal Department of Agriculture, actually or potentially bankrupted forty per cent of the farmers of South Dakota, forty-two per cent of the farmers of Colorado, fifty per cent of the farmers of Wyoming, sixty-two per cent of the farmers of Montana, and over twenty-six per cent of the farmers of fifteen Middle-Western agricultural states, and which has depressed business to the extent of billions of dollars a year, especially throughout the West, South and Northwest, by reducing the purchasing power of the farmers.

The colossal proportions of this nation-wide agricultural catastrophe are revealed by the figures of the federal Department of Agriculture, showing that in 1920 the total value of the American farmer's products shrank over $3,000,000,000; in 1921 nearly $8,000,000,000; in 1922 over $6,000,000,000, and in 1923 over $5,000,000,000 below the 1919 level, showing a total shrinkage for those four years of nearly $24,000,000,000.

What fair-minded man will maintain that either common honesty or common sense will justify the nation in piling on the farmer so crushing a burden and so disproportionate a share of our national post-war deflation?

In the face of these incontestable facts the opponents of farm relief legislation unblushingly declare that "the government can do nothing for the farmer," and that "the farmer should keep out of politics." Unquestionably it is true that the government can not legislate the farmer out of all his troubles, but quite as unquestionably is it true that there are certain varieties of difficulties from which the farmer can not possibly extricate himself without the help

of the government. Can any complacent apologist for "things as they are" show how, except through the instrumentality of government, the farmer can ever hope to get: 1. Lower tariff schedules on things the farmer has to buy. 2. Lower taxes. 3. Lower freight rates. 4. A stabilized dollar. 5. A system of giant power operated to give cheap electric current on the farms. 6. A credit system as well adapted to his needs as is the present system to the needs of business. 7. Law enforcement against profiteering "combinations in restraint of trade." 8. Legislation and administrative action favorable to cooperative marketing. 9. A federal export corporation to dispose of the farmer's surplus crops abroad.

How can the farmers secure economic justice? The successful experience of other groups throws a flood of light on this question.

How did the women get the suffrage? By creating a non-partisan woman's organization that had but one demand and purpose, "votes for women." That organization created a clear-cut issue, aroused the public conscience, educated public opinion and organized the friends of woman's suffrage, *regardless of party*, in every state in the Union and at the national capital into a militant and victorious political phalanx. How was Prohibition put across? In the same simple and direct way. Through a *non-partisan* "dry" *bloc* that organized the dry voters and legislators regardless of party, into an irresistible political power.

Our opponents were not far from the truth when they sneeringly said that our failure to secure relief legislation at Washington during the past few years has been due largely to the personal, factional and partisan groups, purporting to represent the farmers at the national capital. Clearly the only possible way to avoid a repetition of these costly catastrophes is to create a non-partisan political merger of all the members of all existing farm organizations and political parties. For while their leaders inevitably regard each other as natural rivals, the rank and file of the members of all these organizations instinctively realize that they are the common victims of a common enemy and that in their present struggle for "equality for agriculture," "they must hang together or they will hang separately."

Today the East apparently is smugly self-satisfied about a con-

dition which supplies it with farm products from the West at less than their cost of production, apparently oblivious of the fact that any temporary prosperity resulting from such a flagrant economic injustice is bound to be both short-lived and costly. If this situation were the result of voluntary action on the part of the farmers, it would be a form of charity, and I am confident that self-respecting Easterners would have no desire to remain permanently on the farmer's charity list. As it is not voluntary, however, it can be considered as nothing more nor less than a form of "hold-up" and I am equally confident that self-respecting Easterners do not wish to continue to be the beneficiaries of any such legalized piracy. A masterful Eastern industrial bloc of senators and congressmen has succeeded in killing every proposal, so far made, for genuine farm relief legislation. By so doing, they are rapidly forcing the farmers of the country, quite against their natural inclinations and traditions and established partisan affiliations, to form a bi-partisan defensive Agricultural Bloc or coalition of the Republican West and the Democratic South.

A LABORATORY OF FARM LIFE

MALCOLM DANA, JR.
Hartford Theological Seminary

WE students come to a conference of this sort or go into a college conference we have been privileged to attend and hear all sorts of stories about rural life. One of the first things we hear is that the rural church is decayed, and people are leaving the farm by the score. We hear that unsanitary and unmoral conditions exist back of our fine old churches such as never existed in the city of Chicago. We hear that the youth have no advantages at all. The farm home has no conveniences whatsoever. All in all, it is a discouraging situation. One of the greatest of rural men, Jesus of Nazareth, told us if we can believe the Scripture as we have it, "Come and see!" And that the college generation of America is ready to do. How are we going to meet this? As yet, we have no place we can direct them.

We can say, "Come and we will show you a problem that has come up in Connecticut. We will show you a religious problem out on the Pacific Coast. Come into the city and we can show you some of the results of the migration from the country into the urban districts." But have we one place we can point to that is a rural life engineering laboratory? In college we spend thousands of dollars each year upon psychological laboratories. We send students to Europe to study the European situation and student relationships there. We tell students immoral situations exist in some of our cities and they go and see. When we speak about rural affairs, they take what we tell them and frequently swallow it whole.

I believe we can work out, if we use our heads, a rural life engineering laboratory where college students, fine men and women from the farm, interested in the farm, country districts, towns and

villages, may find an outlet to discover for themselves those things they hold so dear.

If you will take a journey with me, we will go up to Connecticut and I will show you what I mean by a rural life engineering laboratory, where college students can come and see rural life at its worst and see what they can do to help make it better.

Coming from near New London, traveling straight toward Hartford, we come to a 240-acre farm, one of the finest in that section of the country, where the milk is tested, where invalids and babies get their source of nourishment recommended by the doctors. That has been turned over by a Honolulu millionaire to a group of interested men for one dollar, to serve as a basis of rural life education or an engineering camp. There we are going to house men and women coming from our colleges to study rural life.

We leave now and go to Montville Center. There we see one of the fine old New England Churches whose society dates back to 1722, and across the road a good will center, a fine school with plenty of light, a little brick library of three to four thousand volumes. We are surprised to see all around this center, Greeks, Italians, Slavs, Jews, Turks, and some fine good old Yankees. We have several mills in this territory. The reason we have so many different nationalities is because the mill owners say the only way they can prevent a strike is to have a great variety so that when the Greeks put on a strike, the Italians won't go with them. So they have a proportionate amount of helpers there every morning.

We leave the center and go up the road and take a turn until we come to Gardner Lake. There some three to four thousand young people are gathered every Sunday—the New London Y. M. C. A., the New London Boy Scout Camp, and private camps for boys and girls. We go down further and strike the main turnpike from Hartford to a town called Bingham. We have two or three Yale professors, a church, down and out as far as interest is concerned. Only last week we had a church meeting there and spent the time discussing what we would do with it. We have every possible rural problem and we expect to find some absolutely new to a good many people in the audience. Right in the heart of this territory we are within the reach of the college world of New England—Yale, Har-

vard, the colleges for women, Smith, Holyoke, and many others. Do you suppose we can entice them to come down and see a real rural life engineering camp like that?

We went to several college groups and put up this plan. We asked if they would send down men interested in studying rural life. What was the response? This year, Wesleyan sent down four men. They came over Saturday morning to help with the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts in the afternoon. They put on an entertainment Saturday night. Sunday night they all joined forces for a community service of Methodists, Episcopalians and Congregationalists.

Then on Thanksgiving Day, down from Dartmouth, some four or five hundred miles, seven men are coming. They are coming down Thursday, missing their Thanksgiving dinner. Friday night they will put on an entertainment, the proceeds to go to the intercollegiate house. We have so many responses from the college world, we can't take care of them. We have one fine parsonage. The people have raised five hundred dollars to equip a room in the intercollegiate house where men and women can come and study rural problems.

Yale, Wesleyan and the Hartford Seminary Foundation have undertaken to equip rooms, put up banners, supply them with furniture, pillows and blankets and all the necessities. Over in Norwich the church is interested. Dartmouth has intimated they will do the same thing when they come down.

Right within the range of the college world, we have a rural life engineering laboratory where college students interested in rural life can come. Out of that we hope will come not only new leaders and new energy but also a new vision showing these young people that go into our colleges that the city is not the place for them but through cooperation and larger community units, larger church and social units, they have a way of going back into their towns and communities and rendering a mighty service not only for themselves but to the whole of rural America.

AS A STUDENT SEES FARM LIFE

LAURA AMOS

MADAM CHAIRMAN, Members of the American Country Life Association, and Friends: I guess I should say that it is a great pleasure to be here tonight. Truthfully it is a great privilege and a pleasure, but frankly, I feel very much humbled to stand here before you. You folks are the leaders of the country life movement, you have made a study of it, and are experts along that line. Then you ask us to come here and tell you what we know about it when we know so little. Besides, I fear I can't give you a picture of country life because I am so much in the center of it I have no perspective. I am a typical country youth myself. I was born and raised and have lived so far on the farm.

I have very few facts. I made no studies as you have as shown by the graphs and charts around the walls. All that I have to tell you are a few things that I have learned from my association with other boys and girls on the farm.

I went to a one-room grammar school with one teacher. I went to a high school that had an enrollment of only two hundred students. From there to the State University, the University of Maryland. I have done quite a bit of 4-H Club work during vacation time. I have worked in almost every county of Maryland and West Virginia and a few of the other States. So the things I will tell you will be just a few things those students and girls and boys have said, but most of it will be my own opinion. So I am just going to tell you right from the bottom of my heart the things I think you will be interested to know, the things I believe farm youth will be interested in and want you to help them with.

When we speak of the farm home those words call forth to each of us some sort of a picture. To some of you, it may be your own home, to others the home of a friend or someone visited in the coun-

try. To a few people, home means nothing, just like the man who said to the real estate dealer, "What do I want with a home? I was born in a hospital, raised in the army, educated in the schoolhouse, courted in the buggy, married in the church, and I guess I will be buried from an undertaker's parlor. What need have I of a home?"

But to me, the farm home is a picture of family unity. The members of the farm home work together, play together, share equal responsibilities about the home, whether it be the care of the flower garden, vegetable garden, dairy farm or whatnot. They have an equal share in the ownership of the farm. The boy becomes a joint owner with dad. The girl becomes a joint owner in the poultry business with her mother. They develop self-reliance and confidence and that is where we think the farm youth is far ahead of those in the city. While they are doing all these things together, they are developing something far more valuable and that is close cooperation and unity. They understand one another and from that understanding they trust one another so much that they take their most confidential problems to each other. The boy and girl go to mother and dad to learn the things they want to know. The city boy and girl do not associate so much with mother and father. The city home is divided. Mother and father are called to one place for their amusement. The older boy is called to another, the younger girls go with their group and the younger boys with theirs. The whole city home is divided. They do not work together as a unit, as we do in the country, and so they don't have that valuable unity.

We believe that a home is not merely a house where you go when you have no other place to go or nothing else to do. I think it is fair to say in the cities many of the homes are just such places. On the farm, the home is a world of love shut in and a world of care shut out. Of course, we have our troubles and our problems, but we all work them out together.

In all of the educational books and magazines, we read that it is the business of a child to play. Is there any better place on earth for them to play than on the farm? Tonight we are celebrating Armistice Day, a great event in the history of our country and also

a great milestone on the road that the farm home is traveling. Since the signing of the Armistice, everything has changed, every phase and every relationship of life, and just as the manufacturers, the salesmen, the industrial people, all classes and kinds of people have changed, so has the farmer, the members of the farmer's family, and the farm home. At the present time, it is undergoing a great transitional period. I can remember when I was small I was taught by my mother and dad to dance, and so were my brothers. They taught us the old fashioned dances, the square dance, the old fashioned waltz. Now they are learning with us the new dances. Instead of playing croquet with us (of which my mother was a champion) we get into the car and go to the theater and movies. We all go together as we used to. The one thing preserved throughout the ages in the farm home is that of unity, working together; even though we are undergoing a change, we are maintaining that.

As I told you, I was a typical farm youth and I come from a home that didn't have all the modern conveniences. Before the War, we had very, very few and yet I wouldn't for one moment have thought of exchanging my home life or my farm home for anything that the city had to offer. Do you think for a moment I would have exchanged all the lovely times and lovely spirit of that farm home for an electric light or a bit of heat? I certainly would not.

Some people today accuse farm youth of allowing the farm virtues to slip. No one in this conference would do it because you people are too far advanced and know better than that, but many people do, and as you know it just is not so. Even though the girls do not wear their skirts so they drag along in the mud and do not wear tight clothing that injures their health, believe me when I say that the farm girls and boys do no worse things in the automobiles today than the people of your generation did in the horse and buggy, or that your grandfather and mother did in the ox cart, or that Ruth and Boaz did in the shining moonlight. That relationship is just the same today as it was in the tents of Israel. That cannot be blamed on the farm youth of today.

It is very difficult now to recognize a country girl from a city girl. One used to be able to say, "There is a country girl or boy,"

but you can no longer. My hair isn't bobbed now but it was two years ago. My skirt is the new length and I even confess that I help nature a wee bit to put color into my cheeks, yet there isn't one can say I am less a lady or less able to manage myself in life, as a teacher, an executive, a demonstrator, a wife or a mother, than any of the old-fashioned ladies. And nine-tenths of the girls on the farm would stand before you tonight just as I do. They color their cheeks and shorten their dresses and bob their hair as the city girls do. They want to do it and why shouldn't they? I believe no better lessons on earth can be learned than those we learn from mother's knee and I thoroughly believe along with the rest of the youth today that just as fine and just as splendid lessons can be learned from the knee of the modern mother, even though her dress be short, as was ever learned from the knee of the old-fashioned mother who wore the hoopskirts and six or seven stiff, starched petticoats.

As I see it, one of the things that farm youth needs today is to have parents participate with them in their work and in their play and to have parents develop the attitude of being with and working with the children. If they do that they will then have the understanding and will be able to be confidential friends with their sons and daughters. But the parents cannot do it if they have to work and drudge all day long. They are too tired, too worn out, and instead of being jolly and full of life and feeling like enjoying the things with the boys and girls, they will be tired. So I believe that we must have some of the modern conveniences in the home, not suddenly but step by step, as we can get them, to take away the work and drudgery.

I do feel that the farm home has a disadvantage for the girls and the one disadvantage is that although we love it with all our heart and want to go back and live there after we get out of college, if we are not lucky enough to marry a farmer, what in the world can we do? The only thing left is to start a poultry farm or to raise flowers to sell, or can fruits and vegetables and sell those, and you know there won't be much market for them. So we have a great problem there of finding something that the girls who are not fortunate enough to marry a farmer can do in order to remain on

the farm. It isn't that we want to leave that we go to the city; we are forced to do it.

One other thing that I think farm youth of today would like to have, not only the girls and boys but also the older people too. We talk so much about the appreciation of the beautiful, taught to the boys and girls and mothers and fathers on the farm, great pictures of the beautiful things they might have around their home are brought before them. Some of the things they can never have for many, many years at least. I think we should change it and talk about the beauty of appreciation, the beauty of appreciation of the things we already have. If we can talk about that beauty and appreciate the things we already have and learn how to gradually make them better and better, we would reach the same goal, get the most beautiful, but when people come along and picture to us these wonderful things that we think we can never get, it is most discouraging, so I believe we should talk about the beauty of appreciation and not appreciation of the beautiful.

So far as religion goes, youth itself differs on the question. The only thing I might say is when Daniel Webster lived in Washington, he never attended church on Sunday. When he went to the country in the summertime, every Sunday found him in church. When one of his friends dared to ask him why, he simply replied, "When I go to a church in Washington they preach to me as Daniel Webster the great statesman; in the country, the preacher preaches to me as Daniel Webster one of many men." He thought that his needs were met in the country more than in the city.

However, youth are not worrying about the religious advantages or disadvantages. They go to church on Sunday with their mothers and fathers and get as good lessons as the city boy and girl.

THE INTANGIBLES IN FARM LIFE

PAUL SANDERS
Pastor of the Community Church, Worth, Illinois

IT takes a lot of nerve for a student to get up here, a mere student, and talk to you men and women who are experts in this field, you men and women who have compiled a volume almost that thick of material on the farm boy and girl. What in the world can we tell you? And yet, when I listen to your discussion, I ask myself, "I wonder if after all they really know the farm boy and girl, and I wonder how many men and women here are fathers and mothers of farm boys and girls, and I wonder how many men and women here have had the experience of being in a farm home." I somehow feel it is easy to talk in the abstract about conditions and situations just like a general does behind his army. He stands back and directs the forces. It is easy to say, "If the boys and girls do this or that, they will succeed," but unless you can really feel the heart throbs, as it were, of a boy and girl, I wonder if you can really understand and know the real problems that they are facing?

Some of you have said, "If you can just teach the boys and girls to raise more corn to the acre, just teach them to raise finer and better pigs, better stock, we will have solved this problem because they will make lots of money and they will have all the conveniences that are necessary for the farm home."

Others of you have said, "If we can just teach them how to understand cooperative marketing, our problem will be solved."

Others have felt that recreation would do it, and others, education.

As I have listened to the discussion, each person seemed to have a hobby of his own, a way to solve this situation. But you know, folks, I believe (and I can only talk from my experience and observation out in the cornbelt states) there is something deeper

than that we want, something underneath it all. Miss Amos spoke of it when she said something about a philosophy of life. If the farm boys and girls can just get an understanding of life, why they are there on the farm, what they want to work toward in life, the right ideal of a farm home and the needs of their own community and their nation, somehow they will solve their own problems. Are you going to come back again and say, "That is what we are talking about when we say education and school and all those things"? You know that hasn't met the situation yet, apparently not out in our cornbelt states. The farm boys and girls are still hungry for something. Why are many of them going to the city? They are not all going to be doctors and lawyers and all of that, but many are going to the city to be teamsters, to work as servants in the homes of people in the city. Their conditions are not any better than their home on the farm. But they are going there because they are looking for happiness. They think on the other side of the fence they will find the thing they are looking for because they haven't yet found a working philosophy of life. What do I mean by that? I mean the right motives, the right ideals to work toward. I am not saying that all farm boys and girls don't have that because we know many of the great men of our nation have come from the farms. I am thinking of our present situation in the midwest on many of our tenant farms, where the men do not own their own homes and where this is a real situation, where the home life isn't all it should be, and where the father doesn't always understand his son as he should, and the mother doesn't always understand her daughter as she might, where there is great hunger between them both for better understanding of one another.

How are we going to give this philosophy of life, this understanding of life to these boys and girls on the farm. You know I believe it has to come through leaders, leaders with a vision, not through those of our country school teachers that go out from the city to take a country school for a year or so until they get into the city to teach. I am afraid they wouldn't give the right vision. It will not come from many of our country ministers who have a very limited view of life. It has to come, perhaps, from our own group, from men and women who will go out to these communities

and work right with these boys and girls and give them a vision of these possibilities. When a boy comes up and has a problem, a life problem, a fundamental problem to him, he needs someone who is going to help him solve that problem, but out in the midwest the father and mother often times fall down because they don't understand and they don't know how to meet the situation.

If we can have boys' and girls' clubs with real leaders (and we have many of them with a real vision in life) like many of those we have out there doing a great work, not always looking at the dollar, not telling them all the time "You have to raise more corn" and all that stuff, we will meet the situation. We need men to tell them how to live, how to appreciate and make their farm life more beautiful, how to make the right kind of a home and not just a place to eat and sleep in as many of our cornbelt farms are. If we can have country school teachers who can do that sort of thing, just as many of the country teachers in the little red schoolhouse that our fathers and mothers tell us about have, if we can have teachers who will go out with a real vision not just to teach the fundamentals of learning but get down underneath and give ideals and vision and work out the problems that face a boy and girl, then we are going to get somewhere.

We are sitting here in a very comfortable place, one of the finest cities of our country, and most of you here have rather desirable positions, that is, you have places out of which you are making a comfortable living, and you are thinking of this problem. Think what would happen if you could be distributed over the country today, each one of you, in a key place, in a farm community, to work out this problem of the boy and girl on the farm. Think of the tremendous things that could be done. Let me tell you, the problem of cooperative marketing could be solved if the boys and girls, our own people, could just realize that it is necessary to trust and have faith in the other fellow.

Most of our problems (I am talking now from hearsay) in cooperative marketing have come because we haven't had faith enough, because some man has become skeptical, one man a bit selfish and the whole thing falls down. If we can just learn to be brotherly in our relationships, if we can just learn to trust one another and work

together in that way, then we can have cooperative marketing. But I feel we won't get that until we do arrive at that place where the students and our younger people coming on can arrive at that place. Yes, we have to have cooperative marketing. We have got to be able to raise more corn and finer and better hogs and stock and poultry and more grain. We have to learn how to do that thing, have to learn how to play together, have to get the right means of education; but underneath it all, we have to understand the meaning of life, to have the desire that is going to make us solve those problems. Let me tell you whenever we can work out this philosophy of life for farm youth, you are not going to have to worry about the problems, because we can solve them ourselves and some day we will solve them. If we, as students, fall down, those coming after us are going to meet the situation and they are going to solve the problems of rural America.

MY EXPERIENCE AS A MOTHER ON THE FARM

Mrs. G. T. Powell

There was a poem running through my mind all the while we have been listening to these lovely things from these wonderful young people. It is a verse from the poet, Longfellow:

> "How beautiful is youth, how bright it gleams!
> With its illusions, aspirations, dreams
> Book of beginnings, story without end
> Each maid a heroine, each man a friend."

There aren't any troubles anywhere which boys and girls as they grow up aren't going to solve.

This conference with its group of distinguished and interested people has reminded me of a picture, a copy of which I believe hung on the walls of your homes when you were growing up; it did on mine and it belonged there. It is a picture of a group of people gathered together in a public place. There are all types. There is a keen-eyed psychologist. There is a man with the broad brow and kind eyes of a philanthropist. There is a gentle-faced teacher. There is another man who simply stands amused and wondering, and in their midst there stands a boy, a beautiful boy like yours and mine, and he is doing the same thing which your boys and my boys and girls are doing every day—asking questions which the most learned of the world can never answer.

I like to think of what came afterward in that picture. You know the story. The beautiful boy who was to grow to be the greatest teacher that the world has ever known did not stay in the temple to be taught of the scribes and elders; he went straight back home to be taught by his father the trade which he knew; to be taught by his mother the things which she had heard and pondered in her heart. It was in a home that this boy received his training, not in the temple.

I have been asked tonight to speak to you as a farm mother might speak of her own experiences and the thoughts which have come to her as a result of those experiences. I have lived for many years on a farm and let me say first that my husband is not an agriculturist; he is a farmer. The farm home is better than some, not as good as many. It is an ordinary farm home. It took eighteen years to bring the electricity to that home. It took twenty years to bring the telephone. It took eight to bring the running water, but all the time it has been a home.

My boy and two girls have been born and brought up on that farm. They have known no playground except an acre almost of front yard and forty acres of back yard. Their first runaway trips were down in the lot and one of them at two and a half went to find her father, was lost in the growing corn until a searching party, headed by that same frantic father, found her sitting on the ground talking happily and earnestly to a flock of crows.

Now that the three are almost grown, I have often studied seriously the traits of character which I believe the life on the farm has helped to develop. We did not know what position in life our children were to occupy. We would have loved to have them stay on the farm but we knew they might go to the city. There were certain traits of character in any case which we wanted our children to possess, and they were these: They must be resourceful and responsible. They must have the habit of work and rejoice in the job that is finished. They must love Nature and try to understand her in all her moods. Above all, they must have a shining goal of splendid manhood and womanhood. I am very well aware that if one's success in child training be questioned, it is considered best to ask the neighbors. But there are battles, there are decisions, there are victories which the neighbors can never know. Our boy finally decided to be an engineer. He loved the farm. He finished college as an engineer. Every summer from June to September he spent in hard work on a truck farm. He learned there when a machine broke down his brain must work fast and he must make repairs with the tools at hand. He was the head of the farm when his father was at market and responsible for the work. He learned the joy of rest that comes after labor. He was never overworked and every fall

returned to college as hard as nails. After college, he worked for a year in Schenectady with the General Electric Company. It was a hard, dirty job, uninteresting, no white collar job.

One day while visiting him, he and I went through the city for an automobile drive. While driving along the street, a voice said, "Mother, look across the street quick." I looked across and there was a grotesque little figure, with a pitiful body and a mighty head which showed the man. My boy looked at me and said, "That is old Steinmetz. Think of it! He and I are on the same job."

I look at him sometimes at twenty-six, a young man with responsibilities which he welcomes, work which he loves, the love of nature which makes him prefer working in his flower garden to playing golf. I believe him to be a modern young man, of whom both country and city might well be proud. I attribute many of those qualities to his home life on the farm.

I can remember two little girls trudging at ten o'clock down in the lot with the basket of lunch for father and two other men, and there they used to help plant cabbages and corn and take long rides on the potato machines. One year they had the joyful opportunity of earning all their jack-o'-lanterns by planting the pumpkin seeds. There were dishes to dry and countless tasks, little responsibilities, absolute responsibilities which came with the sunrise. They gathered nuts and apples. They learned that picnics came when their work was done. They knew and loved all the trees and birds for miles around. They were normal and rosy and healthy. The one who is sixteen has always said (it is her standard remark) "How can anyone want to live anywhere but in the country, on a farm?"

"The family, like a good administrator," says Dr. Groves of Boston University, "farms out more and more of its functions to the school, the church, and other organizations."

May I tell you, not as a professor of social science but as a mother in a farm home with perhaps surely a limited field of vision, what I believe concerning the present job of the farm home as concerns this coming generation: We people on the farm can farm out very few of our functions as families!

The rural home today must in many parts of our country be a substitute for the church and Sunday School. I have had no trouble

in that way. We have driven four miles every Sunday to our meeting where we have taken turns as superintendent of the first day school. But I have traveled through parts of my own state of New York where to the farm family Sunday never comes. The rural church is closed. The automobile is not used to carry the family to the church, perhaps only five or six miles away. There are the same clothes, the same tasks, the same outlook for the first day of the week as the seventh, and if a preacher does come to the church, who is he? He is probably a good, good, old man who has come in his last days to die in the beautiful country. Or, he is a good young man who wants to begin his work in a good place to practice. He is not the live man that is needed to bring to the tired man and woman on the farm encouragement and a vision to show to the rural youth ways of fine living and high thinking.

Our children have always found their recreation cared for at home. It was necessary. There was always a swing, a hammock, a sandpile, a dog, a kitten or two, a horse of age and fine character, and greater than all these things, in attractiveness and resourcefulness, the real farm gymnasium, the barn. We had no neighbor children save two boys. My children's school friends have come often for weekends and parties. Later on, when the demand for movies came, three years ago, the entire family has always gone together. We have never played cards in our home. The radio is there with (let us be thankful) no loud speaker. There is never an evening when we do not have music. One of us plays the violin, the other the piano, and we are not afraid or worried about the farm.

From the farm home as has been my experience, limited I know, must come the teaching of the boys and girls to meet the needs of the school. My own home served practically as a schoolhouse until my boy was twelve years old. This district school was only a few steps away. Only once during these years was a competent teacher employed to teach a handful of children. Five evenings a week I spent precious hours, teaching reading, writing and arithmetic. And when he was thirteen, we were able to send him to a school nearby, five miles away, and his sisters have gone there also. I have driven them every morning and gone for them every afternoon because it was necessary. We did our best for the school. We entertained the

teacher. That may have been some of the trouble. We tried to give her all the good times we could. We visited the school. We talked about the books, but we couldn't make the teacher competent. There was no solution except to do the work in the home. Thousands of mothers and fathers today are busy doing this task and many of them are not prepared to do the work. Those unprepared seek only the educational opportunity for their boys and girls that the farmer with money can get for his.

There also has come to the farm home (there will always be this need) a demand for the teaching of social graces to the boys and girls, and by that I mean the mannerisms by which a Christian, unselfish father and mother can build a home from which may come children fitted for any walk in life. The rural home must do it with little outside help. This it can do and must do. A fine gentleman and his wife living on a farm in Vermont, trained their son to receive royalty in the White House.

I remember reading a story several years ago of a log cabin lady who came to Boston and diplomatic circles abroad but was ignorant of the use of a napkin or of the fork. No beauty of face or character could help her there. It was real suffering and it left a scar afterward. We know that our children, many of them, leaving the farm home to become city dwellers, will bring up families that will grow soft and receive from the country another grist of boys and girls to do the work which must be done in the city and always there will be this migration. It becomes our task as farm fathers and mothers not only to fit for farm life which needs training second to none, but to fit them for all manner of living conditions and to do this work with no outside help.

We have been hearing today what these boys and girls want in their home life. I have been privileged to look over some of those questionnaires and I love some of the answers. They talk of the people who have been of inspiration to them. One of them says "the people in my community who have been of the greatest inspiration to me are my mother and my father. They have never been too busy to answer my questions nor to be interested in my work."

Then we asked the question, "What person of note of whom you have heard would you like to be?" and the answers were many and

varied, but my heart went out to the girl who answered, "Helen Wills." Who wouldn't want to be Helen Wills, playing an almost perfect game, having one's picture in the paper and having a hat named for one?

I do believe the farm home like any other home should be just as attractive as possible and just as convenient as is possible, but I believe that the greater part of dissatisfaction of our farm youth does not come from the lack of convenience and beauty. The farm father and mother have the power to throw a glamour over material things or the lack of material things. There is a light of the spirit. Eyes of boys and girls, however youthful, fixed upon a shining ideal, can be helped to be blind to pebbles under their feet.

The farm home, therefore, today has a gigantic task. The fathers and mothers are in the main unprepared to do the work, but there are among us thousands and thousands possessing the elements of greatness, high ideals and understanding hearts. We grow weary but we go on. At times we faintly discern a pillar of fire by night and see a glimmer of a cloud by day. I think we look for a Moses.

Many things we cannot do for our boys and girls. Many things in education, in art, in social training, perhaps even in religion, we are unable to give to them, but there is a precious thing which we may give them which they may carry whether they remain on the farm or go to the city.

There is the story of a painter. He had grown old and famous. The critics had long seen in every picture he painted three things: A wooded hill, a rippling brook, and a gleam of blue sky. When they asked the old man, he said, "It is my childhood home. It is in my heart; it must always be in my work."

Our boys and girls are going into life. There will be success. There will be happiness. There will be perplexity. There will be trouble, because that is life. Wherever they go we may make it possible that there will be a thought of wooded hill, a rippling brook, and a bit of blue sky, and when times of storm and trouble come, the wooded hill will mean to them strength; the rippling brook will mean to them a gleam of joy; and the thought of the bit of blue sky will invite the upward look to illumine life.

ANNUAL BANQUET ADDRESSES

EUROPE'S FARM YOUTH

C. J. Galpin
U. S. Department of Agriculture

After six months in thirteen countries of Europe, not including Russia or Poland or the Balkans, I can say that I had a little contact with farm youth and saw the farm youth in action. I visited the homes of the farm youth. I visited the elementary schools. I visited the folk schools, the agricultural schools, the schools of domestic science. I stayed all night at the farms, some big and some little, all night with headmasters of folk schools, and believe that I got one or two points in reference to farm youth in Europe which I wish to bring out.

On other trips to Europe, I saw differences mainly. I would see the light wooden shoes on the little Hollanders, the curtsies of the Scandinavian girls, in Finland the military click of the heels of the little lads when they were presented by their people to you and shook hands; but this time in dress, in manner, in behavior, I just saw the similarities and the human quality that resides in each, and so out of this similarity I am bringing you a little bit of a lesson from Europe, if I can put it into words.

There is one bit of environment, however, which presents a difference in Europe that I ought to mention, and that is that the youth as well as the adults of Europe seem to be tasting the unaccustomed sweets of liberty in several respects, in regard to land, in regard to possession especially, and in regard to education and especially adult education. Here is a freedom, a new liberty come into the life of these people which it is ours to interpret who live in the land of liberty, but you see our youth have been steeped so much in liberty that they have no contrast to make with this liberty, such as long years of subjection and oppression.

That little bit of environment in the life of the farm youth of Europe is what gives perhaps a little bit of a difference in their reaction to some things.

The first lesson that I would bring to you, therefore, from Europe is a plea that the farm youth of America—and I am trying to get this lesson over to the farm youth of America—listen with a good deal of avidity, take hold of this goal which has been Dr. Butterfield's, which has been Dr. Wilson's, which has been that of the Country Life Commission, which I found in talking with George Russell over in Ireland was the big goal of George Russell and Sir Horace Plunkett—a new autonomous rural civilization in America.

The thing I noticed among the farm youth of Europe was that when they found that they had this liberty to learn, this liberty to know things, that they seized it, that they sat at the feet of great masters and there imbibed the knowledge not simply from the profit-making motive but from a great, patriotic motive.

It seems to me that that was the great lesson that I learned; coming together under the feet of the great masters, whether in Czechoslovakia, Finland, or Denmark, these boys and girls in some way seized the social motive, seized the great, patriotic motive.

They, I found in Holland, in Belgium, in Czechoslovakia, in Finland, took this learning which they had and seemed to make it a motive which gave them efficiency and skill in agriculture and all of those things which entered into the prosperity of agriculture.

Here at home I find a contrast to that. It seems to me that in America our statesmen, our economists, some of our scholars, believe that in the cooperative movement the profit-making motive is the great and determining motive, that if you can demonstrate to a people that they can make more money through cooperation, that single thing ought to carry the whole thing through.

It was this subtle, underlying, great freedom that I found coming in underneath the profit-making motive in Europe in the little countries which seemed to open their souls wider and their vision wider and their sympathies wider, so that they took in the whole of their country, so that the whole of their country was a reason for their being skillful, prosperous and efficient. It was the whole of their

country and the whole of their class that seemed to underlie the profit-making motive.

I found the contrast in Ireland where, although every Irishman knew that if he would only cooperate to the full as they did in Denmark he could take the market for eggs, butter, and bacon away from the Danes, somehow they have not done it. Profit-making effort is not sufficient in Ireland, although they recognize it and see it, to produce that prosperous agriculture which will go into England and take the market for eggs, butter, and bacon.

My second lesson is just a little continuation of the same, and that is that our farm youth, seizing upon a bit of patriotism as a great force and motive in life, should prepare themselves by skill and learning to go into the councils of the state and the nation and represent agriculture and country life. You cannot expect that agriculture will ever be adequately represented in the halls of the legislature when it is represented by hirelings. We need farmers, farm women, in our halls of legislation to represent the farm.

That is a thing I learned about the farm youth of Europe. They are learning to represent their class and their country in the halls of the legislatures.

I bring you these two lessons. If you had just that vision and that bit of hope which I have, that the leadership of such an association as we have, the leadership upon which it has been built in the past in Roosevelt's Country Life Commission—if those great leaders can come in and animate us again, we can bring this leadership to bear upon the farm life of America and bring to them a preparation to represent agriculture in the halls of legislation.

SOME CONDITIONS IN EUROPE AFFECTING FARM YOUTH

A. R. Mann

Dean of the New York College of Agriculture

There are thirty independent, or largely independent, states in Europe. They differ in racial and cultural character, in language, literacy and land, in density of population, in religion, in climate,

in economic circumstance and natural resources, in ideals, in historical and traditional legacies. Individual and communal customs vary. In some states, as in much of Austria, Czechoslovakia, parts of Spain, and elsewhere, the rural population lives largely in villages, the separate home on the land being less typical. At the other extreme is Norway, the country without a village, as it asserts, where the separate farm home, 25 kilometers on the average from a railroad, marks the landscape. Between these extremes lie the countries with both types of rural habitation, varying in degrees. In one case we have a strong village life and influence; in another, a predominant home life and influence; in the third group, both farm home and village influences. In some countries which in mediæval times were the exploited grounds of ambitious sovereigns or lesser potentates, an organization of rural life based on physical defense was established and still persists to a degree. In other great areas, particularly in southern Europe and the Balkans, where the malaria-bearing mosquito has ruled with the inflexible hand of a dictator, there appears frequently an organization of rural life dictated by the requirements of health defense, the home on the mountainside, the farm in the mosquito-infested lowland. To speak of the tendencies in these 30 diverse states, many of them now reforming and most of them in flux, within the time limit of ten minutes, is to invite generalizations where generalization is hazardous. One would wish to qualify almost any general statement.

Certain conditions control the life that is and that which may be hoped for:

1. *The availability of land.* The continent of Europe comprises less than one-thirteenth (7.6%) of the total land area of the world. On this area live one-fourth (24.8%) of the world's population. The average density of population in the United States is 14.1 persons a square kilometer. Omitting the far northern countries of Europe where latitude, climate, and other conditions restrict human life and activity largely to the more southerly lands, the average density of population varies from 70.3 a square kilometer in Poland to 251.8 a square kilometer in Belgium. This means pressure for land. It means that the average farmer on the continent, the peasant, seldom acquires the use of more than a small area. In many coun-

tries at least 75% of the recorded number of farms—in some as high as 90%—do not exceed 25 acres. No inconsiderable amount of land is held by a few owners—royalty, baronial estates, the church, corporations, wealthy individuals. A pronounced post-war tendency has been to dispropriate these large holdings, usually with compensation, and break them into small areas for settlement and utilization by peasant or farm families who will actively cultivate them. The past eight years have yielded legislation in many European countries to break up these estates and bring them into fuller use. The wisdom of this tendency is not everywhere accepted because of its influence on the production of staple crops and live-stock for the city markets and for export-types of extensive agriculture. From the standpoint of the actual farmers affected, however, they doubtless represent a more advanced situation in life.

To relieve the demand for land one finds also a new impetus for reclamation: drainage of wet lands and marshes; irrigation of dry lands; removal of forests from lands that seem to possess agricultural value; colonization projects financed by governments, corporations, or societies.

Projects of the foregoing sorts have their limitations. Governments and interested voluntary associations have therefore sought means to stimulate production on the existing farm lands. The war brought physical want more acutely than ever to large populations. At its close, many new political boundaries were established, new states were formed, and freedom given to several racial groups which had long been under the authority of neighboring states. At once the desire arose in each of these new political units to become as nearly self-sufficing as possible. The protection and development of home industries became a legitimate ambition of each unit. Fostering agriculture to relieve the long deprivation and to safeguard the future became a national ambition and a public function. Tariff walls sprang up. Their purposes were legitimate; their results sometimes beneficial, but finally obstructive of the economic restoration of Europe. International commerce is a necessity and these protective tariff walls frequently become damaging barriers. The recent pronouncement of an international group of bankers has called attention to the seriousness of the obstacles. Many of the nations have

long since realized the necessity for improved commercial relations with their neighbors, and commercial treaties have been and are being negotiated on a considerable scale; and the tariff walls are yielding or being bored through.

The less spectacular but more effective stimulation to food production is to be found in the very general aid of government in providing facilities for the improvement of seeds, of live-stock, and of the use of machinery, hoping thereby to gain larger production per unit of land.

2. *The availability of schools.* With this effort to increase production from existing lands has gone a most significant development of agencies for agricultural education and research. There has been a general increase in the number of elementary and secondary schools of agriculture and winter schools—institutions which in the past have been the chief reliance of the nations for vocational education of those actually engaged in farming. They are widespread, and in many countries stand close to the people. Belgium has 500 regularly organized evening winter schools in its 2000 rural villages. In little Esthonia, with its 2,500,000 people, fifty lower and middle agricultural schools are projected by the government and in process of creation. Finland has several scores. Greece has two and legal authorization for 33. Roumania has 51. Poland now has 100 lower agricultural schools and is working on a program to provide 800, or two (one for boys and one for girls) in each of its 400 counties. These citations are but examples.

The same impulse has extended to higher institutions and experiment stations. Finland is in process of establishing 11 new experiment stations. Since the war, colleges of agriculture under native control have been created in Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Greece, Jugoslavia. Poland had four and has established a fifth. Belgium had two and has added a third. Holland, Switzerland, and Spain have rebuilt their colleges on a greatly enlarged and improved scale. Denmark has materially added to its facilities. The first Minister of Agriculture under Mussolini projected, with government sanction, a far-sighted reorganization of Italy's institutions for agricultural education, higher and lower, and of its system of experiment stations. Unfortunately, little of it has

yet been realized. Great Britain, with all her burdens, granted 1,000,000 pounds, or about $5,000,000, for the further extension of her already good facilities, much of it going to agricultural research agencies. Progress is in the making, all along the line.

But the rural educational situations in Europe are not confined to considerations of agricultural and home economics education. Any attempt to consider fundamentally the conditions of agriculture and country life must deal with the existing status and efficacy of the rural elementary schools and their relations with any higher system of schools. Here one finds wide variations. In certain countries, particularly in western Europe, facilities are widely available and high standards are maintained. The excellence and severity of the educational discipline can offer our American states examples and suggestions. We cannot boast in comparison. On the other hand, one senses elsewhere three shortcomings in elementary education, varying in importance in the several countries:

(a) Lack of any rural schools whatever. In parts of the Balkans, the two eastern provinces of Czechoslovakia, in large areas in Italy and Poland, elementary schools are not yet available to the children of farmers. Poland and Czechoslovakia are attacking their problems with great energy. In a large area in eastern Poland there is 70 per cent illiteracy; and the older Poland has fine educational standards and ideals. In the past six years, 10,000 rural elementary schools have been established and 35,000 teachers added in Poland, and the Minister of Agriculture stated that 40,000 more are needed to care for 1,000,000 farm children now unserved. In the easternmost province of Czechoslovakia—a country which has taken as its slogan "through culture to democracy,"—there is an illiteracy of nearly 53%. If this country is undisturbed, this will not long stand before its vigorous efforts.

(b) In several countries the rural schools do not extend beyond the fourth grade. Of 25,000 rural schools in Italy, few actually carry beyond the third grade, although the law requires at least fifth grade or attendance until fourteen years of age.

(c) In nearly all countries offering four years or less in rural elementary schools there is no connection between the elementary schools and any higher schools other than the lower agricultural

schools where they exist. Even in Austria, with its progressive people, secondary schools exist only in the larger centers. Small towns, sometimes up to 20,000 population, usually do not have them. Where these conditions obtain, more than a meager elementary education is not accessible to the farm child unless he leave home; and this is rarely possible. Attendance on the higher schools is more commonly by the sons of proprietors rather than the sons of peasants, the actual farm workers.

In these later generalizations there is room for much light and qualification if time permitted their fuller discussion in terms of individual nations.

The time allotted for this discussion is now expired. Nothing has been said regarding the availability of other than farm occupations to the sons of farmers, the availability of social and recreational facilities, and many other matters of leading importance. The tendencies in education for rural home-making and in the extension service are of interest and importance.

In much of continental Europe, excluding perhaps parts of some of the more advanced nations, life is dominated by the necessity of gaining a livelihood from a restricted land area. The child's early life is in an environment of farm work. From this background he acquires habits of great value—habits of work, of thrift, of avoidance of waste, of maximum product from his unit of land. These things make for sturdiness, physical and moral. The child is likely to be prematurely serious, accustomed to labor rather than to play. He is confronted with the expectation of remaining a farmer; populations are less fluid with respect to choice of occupation where there is density of population. The farm child lives more closely at home, where all share in the day's work together in the field. The family bond tends to be close and affectionate. The child acquires skill though he may lack schooling. Generally he grows up to love peace; the peasant is aroused to war chiefly when he thinks his land is threatened. He is likely to be a good, quiet, hardworking citizen. He is worth knowing.

SOME OBSERVATIONS OF DENMARK

E. C. LINDEMAN
New York School of Social Work

I PRESUME I have been one of the Americans who is responsible for the new tendency in Danish life, a tendency which to me seems most regrettable. I don't mean the mere fact that the Danish cooperative societies are not as potent as they once were, which is evident to anyone, nor am I referring to the recent bank failures in Denmark, which were probably the result of the Danish attempt to adjust its currency to that of its chief customer, namely, England, at a time when English currency was going up one-fourth as rapidly as Danish currency, which necessarily entailed sharp financial losses to Denmark.

What I am speaking of particularly as being regrettable is the fact that the Danish farmer during the war and during the period of high profits from furnishing goods to the militant nations during the war, allowed a new motive to enter his mind. I don't mean the profit motive. The Danes have always been economical and always sought a fair margin of profit on their labor. But for the first time since the rise of the Danish agricultural movement, the Danish farmers allowed themselves to be inveigled into the speculative motive, and they invested large sums of the accumulation of the capital of the Farmers' Cooperative Bank in industries, some of them doubtful exporting speculations, mostly in anticipation of what might happen in Russia but didn't happen, and their bank failed as a result of this speculation.

That seems to me one of the trends which we ought from now on to watch closely. The other is—and I presume we Americans are quite largely to blame for this—the Danish people have fallen prey to the tourist lure.

Imagine my shock after having been away from Denmark for almost five years to come back this autumn and find in the office of one of the largest agricultural agencies stacks of little booklets printed in six or seven languages intended for tourists, explaining about their school system, agricultural system, and cooperative

system, a thing they wouldn't have dreamed of doing five or ten years ago. They are now shooting tourists through Denmark as they do in other countries, and I am afraid they are doing it on such a basis that those who come now won't see Denmark from the inside as it ought to be seen.

In other words, the Danish reaction against advertising and exploitation of their own success has broken down; they have become slightly boastful. I presume I may say this frankly because of my Danish ancestry; these things are like family secrets to me.

In the third place, the Danish folk high schools which we all believed, and which we still believe I presume, were at the bottom of the whole Danish culture, are finding themselves opposed by the younger people. As a matter of fact, three of the high schools, three of those quite successful in previous years, have not opened their doors during the last year for want of students, the younger students staying away for numerous reasons. For provocative purposes, I shall give you one. They stay away because they feel the Danish folk school is an ally of the church, and the young people of Denmark are through with the church. They are extremely religious. I don't think I have seen anywhere except in Germany a more earnest desire to arrive at spiritual values. I never heard more earnest discussion among young people about the things which might be called spiritual and religious, accompanied with contempt for the institutionalized forms of religion, namely, the church. They feel that these schools have fallen victim to the churches, that they are too much in the hands of the churches, that religion of the non-experimental variety sways teaching too much. Therefore they stay away. I am not prepared to say how much they are staying away, how much momentum this movement will have, and how far it will carry, but I give you only little pellets of information or at least of observation and tendency which seem to me to be important.

The Socialist government of Denmark is the most intelligent Socialist government of any of the four or five of the world, with the possible exception of Mexico, which shows signs of becoming exceptionally intelligent. The chief movement of the Socialists to do away with the whole militaristic idea seems to be one of the most striking examples of political intelligence since the war.

I had a long talk with the Premier, the instigator of the non-militaristic movement. He assured me that although the land-holding state senators were opposing his movement bitterly, he still felt that the people were so much in favor of the abandonment of the navy and complete disarmament that it would succeed.

THE PEASANTS OF RUSSIA

E. T. Colton
National Council of the Y. M. C. A.

It is only possible, of course, just to lift the curtain and let you look in a little on that moving picture of Revolutionary Russia.

I suppose you would like to see the picture at the point where the peasants come in. Communism is reckoning now with the peasant. Everybody knew when the Revolution came that the peasant was to get the land. There were some differences as to how it should be done. The Kerensky government proposed to move slowly, have a constitution and legislature and bureaus, and endeavor to make the distribution in such a way that it would not disturb the economic order of the country. It gave the Communists the strongest plank in all their platform, which was for the peasants to take the land to the extent of dispossessing the landlords. But along with that right of direct access to the land, although the state theoretically held it and holds it still in theory, along with the occupation of the land, the Communists tried to claim all the surplus which the peasant produced. If the land belonged to the state, the surplus must; so after the farmer had received a distribution that would entitle him to his food, to his seed, and to the forage for his stock, the surplus belonged to the state. The great difficulty was that the second year there wasn't any surplus, and that the ground had to be almost immediately surrendered in favor of a rather heavy taxation in kind.

This happened in the day when there was what is known as militant communism, which meant that the state proposed to gather up the fruit of everybody's labor, pour it into a pool, and out of that pool undertake to distribute it by a rationing system out to

the last capillary of society. The effect of that was still to discourage the peasant from anything like his maximum production, and as a matter of fact it was that which brought on the great horrors of the famine. It is true that the Lord didn't send rain into two of the most productive areas, but normally there would have been a surplus from other areas to flow in and fill up the shortage. Under the system under which they were laboring, there was no existing surplus.

Then came the New Economic Policy, when it was evident that pure communism was going to starve the cities. The New Economic Policy liberated the peasant from the necessity of selling his grain to the buying apparatus of the state. It was possible for him to take his wood or grain or animals to any buyer whatsoever, and he was allowed then to pay his tax in money.

At the present time, the peasant is still dissatisfied because of the great disparity between the price at which he sells his produce and the cost at which he has to buy the manufactured goods. It is that which is bringing about the quarrel or the threatened split in the Communist Party. The split hasn't occurred. The discipline of the party is sufficient to hold it together, and that is likely to continue. But if you want to get a very clear statement of just what that issue is, I would suggest that you read an article in the *Nation* of November 10 by Louis Fisher, in which he describes that problem precisely.

Last year's crop was held out by the peasants at a price that, according to the testimony of Trotsky himself, made it necessary for the government to sell the export surplus in Europe at a loss, and the government recouped by selling to the peasants at an excessive price the goods which they purchased outside from the sale of the exported grain. That issue is still on at the present time. Roughly speaking, a peasant now must produce three puds of grain to purchase what one pud would have gotten in the old days. The result is to limit his production and lead him to hoard what he already has rather than surrender it.

The Government is also in difficulty with the peasant at another point, namely, in its effort to conquer the mind of Russia. They have now established themselves internationally with most countries

on a basis of recognition. They have their own political power inside stabilized. No one with whom I have contact has any other expectation than that the government is in power for an indefinite period. It seems indeed to be increasing its political strength as it organizes society in such a way that occupationally every group that has a part in the building up of a new society is officered invariably by members of the Party. So that that control is not only political but becoming more and more social.

The number of the Communists is still small. They know now they are able to lift the population above the danger of starvation, barring of course extraordinary famine. They have chosen to lead Russia on a low economic level rather than make necessary sacrifices of their fundamental Communist principles necessary to secure loans outside. They are going to try to produce capital inside by increasing production, and that must come from the peasants, so you see the dilemma in which they are placed at the present time. But having now got an apparatus that they are satisfied can keep Russia even on a low economic basis, they are undertaking to conquer the mind of Russia, and here it is that we realize the great departure, the great revolt of Communism against our order of society.

You will understand these men are the products of an iniquitous regime. They are embittered men. They have suffered. They hate not only the institutions under which they suffered, but they hate the society of which those institutions were a part, and they hate the very ideas upon which that society rests.

One of their leaders stated in Stockholm during the war that there were two great obstacles to the social revolution, the church and the home, and both would have to be swept aside. In respect to the home, that does not imply adherence to what was almost purely an invention in the early days of Bolshevism when it was said they proposed to nationalize or socialize women. There was no real foundation to that. They are proceeding by a far more fundamental process to weaken the home in its hold upon the life of youth in the sense that we count upon the home to transmit our most precious inheritances.

Theoretically, orthodox Communism takes children out of the home at three years of age, first of all because then they would have

equitable treatment in respect to education, but as a matter of tactics they say the only way to break with the past, to get a generation with the new idea, is to take the children out of the home before the home has a chance to pass on the old ideas. Of course, for economic reasons that has never been possible. Yet there are ways in which there is being driven in a wedge between the youth of the country and the institution of the home.

With respect to religion, there are probably three reasons why they find religion and Communism incompatible. In the first place, the church historically is conservative. Although there is dynamite and leaven in Christianity, the church on the whole is a stabilizing institution, and revolutionists in all history throughout the world find the church across their pathway.

In the second place, at the time when most of these men were educated—and most of the leaders are educated men—when science and religion were taught, they chose the science and discarded the religion. Far more deep-seated than that is that according to their statement the tactics of Communism and the ethics of Christianity particularly are incompatible. If you inculcate in the working class the ethics of the Sermon on the Mount, it is impossible to create a consciousness of class that will cause the working people to go to war against the rest of the society to secure the rights of the proletariat. That is fundamental and will remain what it is as long as Christianity is what it is and orthodox Communism is what it is.

Here again they find the impact of the peasant class who are held more than any other class of Russia by both the church and the home.

As I sit down, I want to express my confidence and faith in the outcome of the Russian situation. They have endured periods of misrule and tyranny, and they will endure this and will survive it. I believe we can continue to have faith in Russia of which Roosevelt said, when he was President, "As much as any nation of Europe, Russia holds the fate of the coming years."

RURAL WOMEN OF EUROPE

GRACE E. FRYSINGER
Extension Service, United States Department of Agriculture

IN America, if one were to ask of a group of women, "How many of you are rural women," probably the only ones who would reply would be those who live upon farms in the open country.

In Europe, on the contrary, there would be at least three distinct types very conscious of their rural allegiance. First, the woman who with her husband owns a large estate. It has probably been owned by the ancestors of this same family for centuries. They take pride in this ownership of land. It has contributed to their social prestige as well as to their income and to the personal satisfaction of life in the open which is an ingrained characteristic. These women live in luxurious homes and have culture, art and beauty on every hand.

The second group includes the women who are wives of the laborers who work the fields belonging to the estate owner. In most countries of Europe these women as well as their husbands work in the fields all during the crop season from spring until fall and in addition carry on the duties of feeding, clothing and otherwise caring for the family. These women live on the border line of bare necessities. Their homes built of logs or of field stones are centuries old. They usually contain but two rooms and have earth or stone covered floors. There is but little sunlight and ventilation. A simple fireplace or small stove provides the only means of heating. Household equipment is poor, and food is extremely simple fare, long days of hard toil with no opportunity for rest and recreation is the lot of this farm woman.

The third group comprises those who live as freehold owners of farms or as tenants on one of the large estates. Their life is one fairly comparable with that of the American farm family: while they have far more of the comforts than the farm laborer class, they have far less than those of the estate owner class. Prior to the war this group has been exceedingly small in Europe, but with the heavy taxation of postwar days it is steadily increasing.

A fourth group, which in Europe is distinctly rural, includes those who have no direct touch with farm life but who contribute to it and who are dependent upon it. It consists of those who live in the village and render services of a professional and trade nature such as are given by our very small towns and villages in America. But since in Europe this village is usually an integral part of the large estate and since the families of the farm laborers on the estate live in the village and the estate owner and his wife live close by and maintain a relation of guide, philosopher and intimate family friend to all who live in the village, it is very natural that rural consciousness should predominate in this group, as well as the groups more intimately associated with the land.

What of these rural women? Prior to the war the lady of the manor house or villa felt it her responsibility to meet once or twice a year with the rest of the village to indicate her interest in their well being. In addition, as any trouble came, such as illness, she it was who was called upon and who directed proceedings. In case of joyous occasions, such as weddings, christenings, etc., she attended or sent her good wishes and a gift.

The village folk, on the other hand, paid loyal homage to this owner family. They felt secure in receiving wages for regular employment, with no responsibility except to follow instructions. In addition they were conscious of an ever ready source of help and judgment in case of need. To be sure, the freehold owner family lived a life somewhat apart, both in actual distance and in participation in group activities, but the number of such families was comparitively small and but little attention was paid to or demanded by them.

Since the war, great changes have come about. The woman from the estate finds herself with but few servants and those of inferior grade. Taxes have eaten into her income and she has learned that she can no longer delegate responsibilities of management of her household but must herself give time to study her household and its operations and to learn intelligently to direct her own affairs.

The woman in the laborer's cottage has found that she can no longer call upon the great lady for every decision and service but must herself learn what to decide and how to act.

Thus there has developed a realization that the cottager must learn more of responsibility, and the woman of large means must know more of actual operations and this is coming about. In every land rural women are organizing. Titled lady and cottager are unitedly studying the rural situation and how they may best meet it. In some countries there is a separate organization of rural women. In some countries they are meeting in joint organization with the men. In some countries they are meeting with urban women on the basis of a common interest. In every country they are learning helpful facts regarding their income producing activities of garden, dairy and poultry. The nationalism developed by the war has expressed itself in a revival of the handicrafts of generations gone by and women are learning to supplement the income by instruction and these avenues of endeavor. Quite naturally and without predetermined program there has developed an interest in recreation, in pageantry, in chorus singing and in better civic conditions and there are many achievements in these fields.

The leadership in these organizations is entirely volunteer. A limited amount of technical help for instruction purposes is available from public educational sources, but in the main it is the women themselves who are organizing the groups, planning as to the needed instruction and obtaining such technical help as they deem desirable. These leaders are beginning to see the need of increased attention to matters of feeding, sanitation, health and household equipment and the program will undoubtedly increasingly include instruction in such subjects.

This organization of rural women for purposes of studying their responsibilities as homemakers and of obtaining information along such lines is just under way. It has already met an economic and social need. It is democratizing the women of Europe. It is disseminating needed knowledge to rich and poor alike. It is making for intelligent and participating citizenship in lands where universal suffrage now exists but where the rural womanhood has been unprepared for such responsibilities.

It is a large movement; its leaders are conservative and far visioned; and the results already accomplished augur well for the future in terms of mothers who are intelligently informed as to

their daily responsibilities and who have the human satisfactions of rest and recreation and who will provide an increasingly satisfactory environment of health, education, social satisfaction and vocational efficiency for the rural youth of those overseas nations.

THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE—1926

KENYON L. BUTTERFIELD
President of the Michigan State College

THIS Association has had from the beginning a Committee on International Relations. One of the dreams of that Committee has been an international conference on country life. Just about a year ago it looked as though provision had been made for it. We were working through Mr. Asher Hobson, who, as you know, is the American representative at the International Institute of Agriculture in Rome and thoroughly in sympathy with it. We had the backing of Dr. Mann who was over there, and just on the eve of our projecting a plan of our own to have a conference in connection with the assembly of the Institute at Rome last May, we discovered that Mr. Paul De Vuyst had been the leader in calling together a group which had organized a permanent organization for the purpose of holding international country life conferences. We immediately joined forces with him, and the meeting was held in Brussels in July.

It happened that the rural pilgrimage, going under the auspices of this Association, and the individual trips of several of our people, Dr. Galpin, Dr. Sanderson, and Miss Frysinger, had brought together about a dozen Americans who were at Brussels at the conference. The meeting was held there frankly to accommodate the Americans. They had planned to go to Budapest this year.

The conference was a three-day affair. It did not follow the American methods of conferencing.

The thing was beautifully set up. Here is the volume in French and English, everything prepared in advance, some resolutions which we were expected to vote on. They were the conclusions of the conference.

We had to have everything translated. There were delegates there from about twelve countries, thirty perhaps all told, (twelve of them Americans) although there were as many more people attending the conferences at the largest session.

They partly made up for this lack of opportunity for discussion by two events that were really of very great interest to us, not out of curiosity either. They arranged for King Albert to give us audience, which he did. The whole delegation was presented to King Albert and the Crown Prince. King Albert, of course, is a fine figure of a man, one of the admirable figures of the war, and the fine boy who has just come into such great happiness was with him. It was really a fine occasion, something more than just a chance to meet royalty.

Then they gave us a long, full day out in the old, devastated area now reconstructed. They claim Belgium has been ninety-eight per cent reconstructed, and it has been done without reliance on the indemnity from Germany. They saw they weren't going to get it. They went into their own pockets for it. You see a city, for instance, of thirty-five thousand, rebuilt on the old lines, villages rebuilt, land recovered. You see occasionally a pill-box, and now and then there is evidence of a trench, but about the only feature prominent is the lack of trees. Some of the best crops I ever saw in Europe were right on that land that was in ruins seven or eight years ago. I saw the devastated area around Verdun, and I have carried that picture with me all through the years of what we saw that beautiful day in Flanders.

Well, that was the conference. I want to recur to the meaning of this conference, however, just in a moment and to speak of one or two practical things. They accepted our invitation to come to this country this next year, and, as you know, the plans are that in connection with our next conference of this Association at East Lansing next August, this international conference will be held. We don't expect a large delegation from abroad. They are poor. There isn't time to work up even small delegations from many countries. Probably many countries won't be represented, but we do hope that we have the means by which we can induce a fair representation form a number of countries to be over here next year. They ap-

pointed three committees—this was really at the instigation of the American delegation—one on research, which asked that Dr. Galpin should be a member; one on the training of teachers and leaders, which asked that Dr. Sanderson should be a member; and then one on a question presented by our American delegation to the conference, which is the effort to see if there cannot be worked out a sort of statement or formula for rural community development that will be usable the world around. This was urged because of the feeling that Dr. Wilson has voiced, this notion that the community idea, the local group, whether it be the village of Czechoslovakia or even the potential community or whatever form it may take in Norway with those isolated farmers, or the town and county community, or the open community of the United States—they can all find a common ground for discussion and for activity in the rebuilding of these thousands and tens of thousands of local communities the world around.

There are supposed to be 750,000 rural villages in India and at least 1,000,000 villages and hamlets in China, and I don't know how many villages in Russia, all with possibilities in the development of a community life on the very largest and finest lines, community consciousness and not merely the community program of itself, but, as Dr. Wilson has so happily said, "the outlook toward the world, out of this little world into the great world."

There isn't time of course even to indicate the scope of that possible statement, but they appointed a committee to work on it and have some sort of point for the next conference.

We can't announce any special program for this conference. We do want to urge the American people who are interested in country life to include the international conference in the summer program as well as our own conference of this Association. I suppose it is very easy for one who believes strongly in internationalism and the need of it to be overenthusiastic about this conference, but I can't help feeling that way about it. I feel that way about it perhaps very largely because of the significance of the rural people, the significance of getting over this community idea in all its democratic and religious implications for America and for the world.

Here we are dealing with the fundamental human welfare, the

quality of the people, and for all we know for the welfare of a billion people, probably two-thirds of the world's population, and that isn't the only significance of it. We are facing their problems, the problems of quality of life all over the world, not merely in terms of these huge numbers but because of the tremendous facts that have come into the world in the last few decades and even in the last few years; one, the constant pressure for industrialism and consequent building of cities and the question whether under those conditions the country can maintain itself with respect to quality of people; and the other, the democratic urge and the question whether these great hosts of rural folk the world around can play their part in effective democracy. There are great issues at stake and I couldn't help but feel that even this little conference with its comparatively weak program, bringing together just a few people from a few countries in just those few hours, unsatisfactory as it was from many points of view, although delightful and promising from many others, contained within itself the seed of a great mustard tree; because of forces that we are attempting to harness, because of the issues that are at stake in the work, in life, in the future of these great multitudes of people living on the land of the world.

I think it was also significant that this very summer there was a group fairly representative of the American Country Life Association in Europe, for periods of a few months or weeks, studying situations and making contacts and friendships and getting firsthand information about conditions there and leaders there.

All of it, as I see, comes back here finally to us and our duty and our opportunity and this little Association, the International Country Life Commission, was not only an interesting and worthwhile thing in itself but it has its great meaning because of the possibilities that lie tied up in that little seed which has been planted.

PART II

THE DISCUSSIONS OF THE CONFERENCE

Thursday Morning Session

November 11, 1926

1. WHAT IS THE SITUATION FACED BY FARM YOUTH?

The meeting convened at nine o'clock, President Butterfield presiding.

Introductory Remarks

President Butterfield: The Board of Directors asked me to make a preliminary statement on their behalf. This is our ninth conference and from the very beginning some theme has been taken for the conference, and this year, acting very largely on suggestions from those that are dealing with rural youth made some two years ago or more, this subject was taken. It goes without saying that it is as significant a theme as we have had.

All along through the years there has been the question of program, not only as to theme but as to method. During the past few years there is no doubt but there has grown up a revolt against a method which had become stereotyped—a set of talks and addresses with limited time for discussion. I am not speaking particularly of our Association. I am speaking of the great American habit of conferring in an associational way. I suppose every one of us has had experience in coming away from a program that was high grade and very much worthwhile and yet which didn't impress us very much because there was no chance really to strike fire by discussion.

Some three years ago the Association gained the opportunity of attempting to try the newer method under the leadership of one of the masters of the craft and this is the third year that we have followed this plan.

The people who are closest to this program are ready to assert

that probably very few conferences, if any, in America have had the preparation in advance that this one has had. Agencies of the government here and the officers of many private organizations have cooperated, have put in a great deal of time and thought, an unusual amount of interest has been shown and a very extensive and complete job apparently has been done.

I think that an investigation of this kind preliminary to a conference on a thing like Farm Youth is likely to reveal more authoritative material than could possibly come from any individual or any set of individuals who simply spoke out of what they already knew. Here is a fresh survey brought up to the minute along the line of the very theme and for the purpose of the discussion at this conference.

Finally the success of the conference in which we are all interested is not a matter for the Board of Directors of the Association; we are simply the instruments and this is your affair and the good of the conference comes from what you get out of it and what you take back. The success of the conference is due only in part to leadership and to method. It is due far more to the complete and hearty cooperation of everybody in the conference.

Now, in the language of the street, let's go. I present Mr. Elliott!

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: I would like to say one word about our work together which is implied in what President Butterfield has said, that my relationship here this morning is entirely in a representative capacity. The detail plans for this conference have been worked out by most careful consultation of a great many people, both in the actual plan itself and in the gathering of more specific information and data which might be used. Consequently, I simply am, this morning, a chairman of the meeting and a part of this cooperative enterprise in which we are all engaged and we are eager that we shall have the most careful and thorough anticipation of every person here.

At the beginning of the session, I wish we might follow Dr. Butterfield's outline and see the relation of the five so-called "discussion sessions," one to the other. It is quite impossible to conduct a conference of this kind which has only five sessions and which is attempting to solve very difficult problems or give some help on

solving them without considering the whole conference as a unit. It is rather presumptuous to expect in five sessions to make much progress anyway on problems as difficult as the ones here. The only way we can make progress which we have any right to record is in thinking of these five sessions as a unit so that we have some ten or twelve or fifteen hours of earnest conference together upon some problems, at the end of which, out of our experience, with the help of the information, we may be able to record at least a few steps ahead.

The session this morning which is outlined in the syllabus, as Dr. Butterfield said, is going to attempt to survey the situation, to see what is after all the judgment out of the experience of this group as to the places where we are most encouraged and the places at which we would like to take hold to make some progress for the improvement of country life. At the second session, we will divide into sections by types of interest, to explore the problems here, because there are so many of them that to attempt to cover them all in each group would make it difficult.

We come together in the third session to report the results of our small group sessions and to attempt in discussion together to see if this does bring us to any main items that we would really feel we united upon. You can see these three sessions are literally a unit.

Then we take the last two sessions to recognize more particularly our agency responsibility and we divide by agency groups. We hope that we have made the division so that you will not only have people of one agency but a number of agencies talking things over.

Then there will be a final general session, to try to see where there are overlapping to adjust so that we go from here understanding something of the problems and something of the hopes of each group and that we do not go off as isolated individuals, working in this field, but with something of a sense of comradeship.

The committee is expecting there will come out of this, needs for experimentation or investigation where there is lack of knowledge. Here will be some opportunity to set up and see if we can do anything upon these matters.

I hope I have made clear then that we are engaged in an enterprise that is a unit and that if we close the morning's session with

nothing but problems, it means the conviction of this group is that one of the first things to be done is to find where you want to take hold. You may find out you are taking hold at a place that is not significant. We are trying this morning to compare our places and to check our own emphasis against the perspective of other people who look at the country from other points of view than our own.

We will go then, if you are willing, directly into the discussion. Turn to the syllabus. You will find the first part says that the purpose of our morning's session is to review the conditions favorable and unfavorable facing farm youth and particularly to discover at what points progress is most necessary in farm life for the sake of the farm youth of the present generation.

The first two questions which are suggested have to do with satisfactory and unsatisfactory conditions in the country among farm youth and viewed by farm youth themselves or the parents or leaders of farm youth. The suggestions here are: 1. With what conditions in the country are farm youth or the parents and leaders of farm youth most disatisfied as regards:

a. Vocational opportunities and conditions.

b. Home life in the country.

c. Community life in the country.

We wish you would indicate very briefly but describe quite clearly or give some evidence of this condition and the feeling of the point at which it is unsatisfactory. I will keep a running record of headings. We want to see just how this situation looks to the people who are living in the country and how it looks to their parents and to their leaders and put ourselves back in the farm situation just as far as it is possible in Washington and in the Hotel Willard.

What are your suggestions of conditions?

Miss Edith Moon (Penn.): The lack of cultural opportunities. Coming home from college, one misses the contacts with the great thinkers of the country because they so rarely get into the smaller communities.

Dr. Edmund des Brunner, Institute of Social and Religious Research: Lack of economic opportunities. In the data worked over by some of the people in preparation for this conference, the reasons

for not going into farming given by farm youth where the depression was most severe, was the lack of economic opportunity.

Mr. Hacker (Illinois State Normal University): The inequality of educational opportunity. For example, in Illinois, we find the training of teachers is all the way from three to four or twenty-five times as great in the cities as in the one-room schools.

Mr. Felton (Cornell University): I want to cite as an example a township of 600 people, I suppose, having in the neighborhood of one hundred youth, all farmers except twenty-six families and there are two churches and elementary school but no high schools. There are twenty-one members of one church and eighteen of the other but neither has a young people's class and there are not enough people to have a young people's church. If a boy goes into either Sunday school, he has to go into the primary class or the old ladies' class.

Miss Merrill (American Library Association): Eighty-three per cent of the rural communities are without public library service. The figures are practically reversed for the urban population.

Miss Moore (Delaware 4H Club Work): There is lack of an understanding of nature study. After all, I find that has one of the strongest appeals in the schools among groups of children generally.

Summary of Discussion.

Chairman Elliott: We seem to have up to the present time four types of condition which are causing dissatisfaction: Lack of cultural opportunities; economic depression; inequality of educational opportunity and the smallness of the farm community, making it impossible really to have a significant center for school or church or other activity.

Dr. Kirkpatrick (Bureau of Agricultural Economics): What are the evidences that there is lack of these things? Are we basing that impression on opinions we form or have they stated they lack these, or are there some evidences such as the farm people leaving the farms in great numbers or small numbers.

Miss Moon: It was based on the statements of farm folk with whom I have spoken and who have told me that the reason they wanted to get to the city was that they might have greater advantages along these lines. There are a great many young people

leaving the country because they cannot find satisfaction in the country life.

Mrs. J. W. Jones (Md. Farm Bureau Federation): I believe the attitude of the parents has as much to do with the farm youth leaving the farm as anything there is. I think I can speak from experience.

Dr. Fannie W. Dunn (Teachers College, Columbia University): The mother of a farm boy doesn't want him to be a farmer; she wants him to be a doctor or lawyer. I think you will find it is the attitude of the parents who want their children to do better than they did.

Chairman Elliott: Why do they consider it better to be a doctor than a farmer?

Mrs. Jones: They forget everything in life but the dollar. They forget the things we get on the farm that can't be bought.

Dr. Jonathan Hawk (Editorial Staff, M. E. Church): I think one reason why the farm woman wants her son to become a doctor, preacher or lawyer is because in literally thousands of counties there is no good means of communication. By communication I mean transportation as well as word-of-mouth communication. The roads are bad. The farm boy and girl drag through the mud, two, three or four miles every day to school. When he wants to talk to a neighbor four or five miles away, he pulls up the telephone receiver and he rings, and rings, and rings. After going through four or five centrals, he gets a wheezy whine. He can scarcely hear and for an hour he tries to communicate with that fellow who has a sheep to sell or a pig to kill that he wants some information about. Therefore, the warm woman says, "I will not drag my boy along the same weary road. I don't want him to be always where he can't reach his friend or where my girl can't see a silk stocking."

Mrs. Powell (New York): The hundreds of farm women and men who have told me about their dreams and desires for their boys and girls, and more especially the boys, think not so much about the money. They want the boys to be looked up to. They want the boys to be in a business of which they may brag just a bit. They want them to be dressed well from morning until night.

They honestly want that and they want them to have just as easy a life as possible.

Miss Ida Brenner (Council of Jewish Women): I find in my experiences that the boys and girls have not the opportunities for recreation in rural districts.

Dr. O. G. Brim (Ohio State University): I would add social life to that. Mr. Felton spoke with reference to Sunday school and church. There are not enough boys to get together to play ball, not enough children to have a good dance or party or get up a good camping crowd. The social life in the country is limited because of numbers and because of the parents oftentimes. Sometimes it is too much work and sometimes it is the attitude of the parents.

Mr. Shinn (U. S. Bureau of Education): I wonder if we looked into all of these discussions that have come in so far that we might not think we could move everybody off the farm into the town. We still have plenty of people living on the farm. It occurs to me in a good many instances that we are dealing with such things as difficulty of getting downtown on a street car on a rainy morning, the unpleasant temperature in a city flat, as applied to city life and which are only little, external things. The fact of the matter is a large number of people living in the country are perfectly happy with rural life or they wouldn't stay there. We haven't universal discontentment at all. What we are doing here is bringing out a few of the trivial difficulties of life. I don't think we can take that as an index of what has really happened. We haven't a great run-off in population from city to country; we have only a small movement that is very normal. It seems to me we ought to point off some of the good things in the country.

Chairman Elliott: Will you say a word more about why they are staying on the farm?

Mr. Shinn: I think because they realize the farm offers the greatest opportunity for them to effect a change and that all the opportunity for change is within their own power. A boy coming on the farm can have a cow produce three thousand pounds of milk or he can have one that produces twelve thousand pounds of milk. He can have hens lay twenty-five or fifty eggs a year or hens that will lay one hundred and twenty-five eggs. He can have land that

will produce nine bushels of wheat or land that will produce twenty-two bushels of wheat. All that is within his own power and that general satisfaction is the thing that keeps people on the farm.

Dr. Pittman (Michigan State Normal College): I am not sure the point of view I wish to present is in line with what you have, but it seems to me it is related. I am wondering if people leave the farm because of these small problems or if they leave the farm primarily because they have not fully grasped what the problems are. It seems to me the people who are staying on the farms are the people who have an economic and social grasp of the job and that challenges them and that matures them and makes them grow. It is the individual, it seems to me, who is thinking superficially and is being oppressed by small matters that leaves the farm and goes to the city. The individual who really succeeds is one who thinks in large terms. He recognizes the economic problem and social problem and throws himself into the job of really trying to change that situation.

Miss Rich (U. S. Extension Service): I think that life as a whole is largely made up of trivialities and that one of the chief contributing factors in this discontent is lack of mechanical convenience in the country. The average farm woman has struggled so much in the home with no conveniences, she is not willing for her daughter to go through the same thing and therefore she encourages her to leave the farm.

Dr. Willard (Michigan State College): I wonder if we are distinguishing between those conditions where there is dissatisfaction in areas which are fundamentally prosperous and other areas where population grew too fast. The significant thing is to make that distinction. There are areas where farms should be abandoned. On the other hand, there are some very large and materially prosperous areas where there is dissatisfaction. It does not seem to be founded on permanent economic disability and could be changed.

Summary of Discussion.

Chairman Elliott: We have had two or three types of distinction made in the last few minutes: Cultural opportunities, educational opportunities and economic opportunity. Then the question

of facilities in the country, recreational conveniences and so on. Several people have raised the question whether some of these things are not trivialities, whether there are not much more important questions that could be gotten at.

There is one other set of things here which has been suggested and that is the reason for this whole attitude—the extent to which there is really dissatisfaction in the country and the extent to which that dissatisfaction is a dissatisfaction of the parents who do not want their children to repeat some of the difficulties that they have had and the inconveniences. Is there any additional suggestion you wish to make upon this question?

Mr. Engels (State Club Leader, Vermont): It seems to me one of the greatest needs of farm youth and rural youth is the right kind of leadership. This matter of educational opportunity and cultural opportunity is going to be solved there. I think we overemphasize when we call it lack of opportunity. There is a dearth of leadership of the right kind.

Dr. C. E. Vermilyea (Home Missions Council): It seems to me one of the facts is the depressing effect of social classification which affects the dignity of the farmer and his group. What I mean by that is this: Whether we like it or not, the farmer is classified in such a way that it affects his aspiration and his outlook. It makes him dissatisfied so far as the future of his children is concerned. In some respects it leads to comparative indifference as to what ought to be done for his children.

Dr. Elizabeth Adams (Girl Scouts): I think one economic factor is the long hours. I have observed that particularly where there is an adjacent village and the village boys and girls have short hours. I have seen them leave the farm and take up work that is paid for by the hour in the village. I think when other boys and girls go to the city, the economic reward is presented to the farm boy and girl only in terms of salary and he never thinks what he has in the way of living in the country. It is a fictitious increase in economic return that is presented to the farm boy or farm girl largely.

Miss Powell (Michigan): It seems to me one of the significant lacks is a lack of good rural health conditions—doctors, nursing service and dental service.

Mr. Rapking (West Virginia University): It seems to me it is an inadequate philosophy of life: the attitude toward life as a whole is fundamentally unsound. They have an inadequate philosophy of life, a lack of proper ideals, proper perspectives. They think a large salary and chasing around in automobiles is life.

Miss Anna Clark (National Board of the Y. W. C. A.): Is that a rural or national fault?

Dr. E. B. Mumford (Michigan State College): The depreciation of rural life values on the part of both country and city peoples is diminishing as we hear statements of the advantages of other occupations given to the young women by women in vocational courses who have worked out the real values in country life.

Mr. Gabriel Davidson (Jewish Agricultural Society): I find that many of the boys are dissatisfied because they don't know what they are working for in so far as money return is concerned. The income all goes into the family pot. If the boy needs clothes or recreation, he has to ask his father for the allowance to cover it. He compares his condition with his friends, particularly in the city, and he finds the other boy is getting fifteen or twenty or twenty-five dollars a week, or getting a share of the income from the business if he works for his father, and he feels dissatisfied that he doesn't know at the end of the week just what his return is going to be for his labor.

Mr. Robert Foster (U. S. Extension Service): It seems to me the problem before the conference is that of farm youth. I would like to see some of the professionals checked by farm youth themselves. Some feel farm youth attitudes are not significant. I believe we feel in the situation a satisfaction or dissatisfaction in accordance with the conditions which are surrounding us. I would like to hear from the farm youth.

Mr. Hall (West Virginia University): It appears to me that we have a lack of proper education from the time of the primary school up to college in our school system. We don't get the proper education in agriculture.

Another thing that bothers me is that there are so many farmers failing. Why are they failing? We look around and find many

farmers in any community we go having difficulty. How are you going to solve that?

MR. GARNETT (Virginia Experiment Station): If we want to know why farm youth are leaving the farm, I think we should give as a reason the lack of capital to start farming on their own responsibility. That is becoming an increasingly important problem. More capital is needed and with the depressed situation in which farmers find themselves and the increasing cost of land, it is hard for the parents to give the farm youth aid in setting up their own farms or renting farms on their own responsibility.

MR. JENKINS (Maryland State Club Leader): I would like to say a word to the thirty or forty farm youth who are right here, if you please. I think I know about half of them personally. You notice, you young people, that the folks who have been talking about your problem have been men thirty-five years off the farm and the women ten years off the farm. They are thinking in terms of the problems they had when they came off the farm, which are the same problems we had. When you get into these groups, don't let those folks do all the talking. You talk about your problem which is the present problem as you know it now.

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: One of the functions of a conference of this sort will be to get in touch with existing data upon the situation. So that it may be possible to carry away some of this, Dr. Kirkpatrick is going to give us some information about what is available.

DR. E. L. KIRKPATRICK: Farm youth are farm boys and girls, somewhere between the ages of ten and twenty years, probably averaging about fourteen or fifteen residing on farms. (See Chart A, Page 70.) The agencies represented by these farm boys and girls are: The 4-H Club members, Federal, Vocational pupils, Red Cross, Y. M. C. A., Y. W. C. A., and non-selective. By non-selective we mean those farm boys and girls who attend one-room country schools and village schools and so on.

The preliminary report which you hold in your hand deals primarily with the 4-H club members not because we wanted to exclude the others in the analysis but because we had these five thousand questionnaires first to tabulate. In the main, the material from the other groups, which was tabulated only yesterday, and which I have

CHART A

FARM POPULATION OF UNITED STATES 10-19 YEARS OF AGE (1920 CENSUS)

3 ciphers omitted

	Total	Male	Female
United States	7,292	3,778	3,514
New England	115	62	53
Middle Atlantic	378	200	178
East North-Central	1,030	542	488
West North-Central	1,131	592	539
South Atlantic	1,605	823	782
East South-Central	1,274	651	623
West South-Central	1,321	677	644
Mountain	249	131	118
Pacific	189	100	89

checked very carefully since it came, is the same as that represented in the report and as that represented in the charts which I will call to your attention. I shall point out a few exceptions. The principal reason I raised the question as to what were the evidences that we have that farm boys and girls were dissatisfied with farming is because a good many have gone on the assumption for the past fifteen years or so that a large percentage of farm boys and girls are dissatisfied and tumbling over each other to get off the farm. The results from this questionnaire did not show that.

Ninety-five per cent of these 4-H club members express themselves as being satisfied with the situation. They were asked if they liked to live where they were, that is, on the farm or in the village. Ninety per cent of every group were satisfied with the conditions as they found them. That doesn't mean their parents were satisfied in every case.

Checking further on the question of whether or not they are satisfied, fifty-five per cent of the boys of the 4-H club gave as their preferred occupation or choice of making a living farming. In nó group did that fall below forty, so that many of them are considering farming as an occupation. In no case did the percentage of girls who preferred teaching fall below fifty and it usually ran around fifty-eight in all the groups. Over five per cent of the girls considered farming as a means of making a living. We don't know at

all whether they understood the term of occupation as a means of making a living. Possibly they felt that did not include home-making. Possibly if they did not feel that, they were hesitant about stating that they preferred to become a farmer's wife.

(For factors influencing boys in deciding where to live see Chart B.)

CHART B

FACTORS INFLUENCING BOYS IN DECIDING WHERE TO LIVE

Desire For More Freedom Than City Life Permits
Love Of Nature
Desire for Modern Conveniences (Phones, Running Water, etc.)

Experience In Agriculture—Born On A Farm
Sociability Of Neighbors
Interest in Agricultural Pursuits (Poultry, Dairying, etc.)
Liking for Fresh Vegetables, Milk, Eggs, etc.

Desire To Work On Own Initiative—To Be Independent
Opportunity For Physical Development—Health
Necessity For Making A Living
Fondness For Sports (Riding, Hunting, etc.)
Interest In Breeding Registered Stock

Desire For Labor Saving Machinery
Fertility Of Soil
Cost Of Living
Variety Of Work—Not Monotonous

Four per cent of the boys and seven per cent of the girls have aspirations to take more than four years in college. Fifty-seven per cent of the boys and sixty-nine per cent of the girls have aspira-

CHART C

INTENTION TO CONTINUE EDUCATION—EXTENSION SURVEY, 1926

3594 4-H CLUB MEMBERS

	Boys		Girls	
	Farm 1297	Village 166	Farm 1554	Village 577
	%	%	%	%
College More Than 4 Years	4	7	3	5
College 3 or 4 Years	57	69	57	66
College Less Than 3 Years	12	5	14	10
Finish High School Only	21	16	22	17
Not Finish High School	6	3	4	2

tions to take between three and four years, usually a four-year college course; twelve and five per cent about three years (usually that meant a business course); twenty-one and sixteen per cent were going to finish high school only. The small percentage of six and three were not going to finish high school or not enter high school.

Dr. Davis: I understand these questionnaries were sent wholly to 4-H club members.

Dr. Kirkpatrick: There were about five thousand returns from 4-H club members in the analysis, seven hundred from Y. M. and Y. W. C. A. members (primarily girls, six hundred or over), between six or eight hundred on a non-selective basis, and six hundred from Federal Bureau of Vocational Education. The replies from the 4-H group were tabulated separately. The others were on the same basis and all of the comparisons were made on the basis of percentages, so we can tell accurately whether one checked against the other. It was very surprising to know that on the basis of percentages the replies worked out nearly the same. There is a suggestion, however, among the sets of data to the effect that 4-H club workers and Federal Vocational Workers have exerted some influence on the choice of farming as a means of making a living. There is also a suggestion that farm boys chose farming because they found their

CHART D

EXEMPLARS NAMED BY FARM BOYS AND GIRLS LIKING FARM AND VILLAGE LIFE

Exemplars Named (Classified by occupation primarily)	Boys		Girls	
	Farm 914	Village 128	Farm 1181	Village 433
	%	%	%	%
No one	17	18	12	9
Teacher	15	17	39	38
Parent	18	23	15	19
Farmer	30	7	4	5
Farmer's Wife	.2	0	6	.5
Nurse, social worker	.1	0	3	7
Business man, stenog., clerk	6	11	4	7
Mechanic	3	5	.3	.2
Pastor	3	2	2	3
Other	7	17	16	18

exemplars in farmers, their father or some other farmers, primarily others, and that girls chose teaching because they found their exemplars or ideals in their teachers and not in their mothers. Relatively few, as I recall, found their ideals in their mothers or other farm women, but mainly in their teachers, those individuals who got closest to them, who established the closest personal contacts.

Other charts referred to by Dr. Kirkpatrick follow:

CHART E

MEMBERSHIP IN DIFFERENT CLUBS AND ORGANIZATIONS AS REPORTED BY BOYS AND GIRLS LIKING FARM AND VILLAGE LIFE

	Boys		Girls	
	Farm 1265	Village 165	Farm 1555	Village 570
	%	%	%	%
None	2	0	1	.5
4-H Clubs	91	89	95	93
Boy Scouts or Campfire Girls	13	33	9	14
C. E., Epworth League, etc.	19	23	27	36
Social (Local)	7	10	14	20
Other	3	5	2	3

CHART F

PARTICIPATION IN MUSICAL ACTIVITIES—EXTENSION SURVEY, 1926

3670 4-H CLUB MEMBERS

	Boys		Girls	
	Farm 1325	Village 167	Farm 1586	Village 592
	%	%	%	%
Sing	66	61	80	79
Play piano or organ	10	13	48	57
Play other stringed instrument	11	13	9	16
Play other wind instrument	12	22	3	5
Play other instrument	4	2	9	5
Member band or music club	10	19	12	23
None of above	27	28	12	11

CHART G

AVERAGE LABOR INCOMES FROM FARMS IN PREWAR, WAR AND POSTWAR PERIODS

Labor Income Groups	23,083 Records 183 Areas 33 States	7,531 Records 67 Areas 24 States	5,649 Records 32 Areas 17 States
Highest	$1,586	$2,379	$1,953
Second	660	1,171	538
Third	330	716	10
Fourth	44	301	540
Lowest	−504	−474	−1,849
Average	$ 423	$ 819	$ 22

Table prepared by H. M. Dixon.

CHART H

CONVENIENCES ON FARMS

(U. S. Census, 1920)

PERCENTAGE OF FARMS HAVING CONVENIENCES AS LISTED

	Automobile	Telephone	Water in House	Gas or Electricity
	%	%	%	%
United States	31	39	10	7
Northern States	48	62	15	11
Southern States	14	20	3	3
Western States	42	32	26	15

CHART I

HOME CONVENIENCES—EXTENSION SURVEY, 1926

3712 4-H CLUB MEMBERS

	Boys		Girls	
	Farm 1357	Village 168	Farm 1593	Village 594
	%	%	%	%
Telephone	62	52	56	57
Automobile	87	80	84	75
Phonograph	48	63	46	54
Running Water	38	70	31	64
Radio	27	39	19	30
None of Above	5	2	6	3

PROFESSOR GARNETT (Virginia): Don't you think the lack of vocational guidance has a lot to do with these attitudes? They don't know the opportunities and other preferences that come to those who had more opportunity of knowledge of other things.

DR. KIRKPATRICK: I don't know whether I should venture to state what I think on that. I should say, in the main, that these boys and girls have not reached the age where they are weighing for themselves any philosophy of life. Probably when they get into college they begin to study then, but I have talked with men and women in the Department of Agriculture and in Government service and with teachers and with people who have been brought up on the farm since we started this study and I have asked them, "After all, why did you decide to leave the farm? Why did you choose the occupation you are in?" The majority reply, "I do not know why. I went to college and took the first thing that came along. I was looking for a job when I got through college and this thing appealed to me at that particular time and I took it."

DR. DUNN: I want to speak of vocational guidance. If it is true, as Dr. Kirkpatrick has stated, that the youth isn't thinking of the job he is going into until he gets to college, I think we have one of the greatest arguments for the point he made. Such a small proportion get to college that it is highly essential that society should provide vocational guidance for the boys and girls who might go to college if they saw in college a means for the vocation they have selected, or for the boys and girls who can go into their vocation without college or go in blindly because they know nothing to do but farm or teach or open a garage.

The second point I want to speak on is the question of selection. This report is a report from the selected group and should be interpreted in relation to that. There seems to be a bias caused by the influence of the 4-H Club leaders inducing boys to adopt farming as a vocation when they otherwise would not have adopted it.

I want to raise the question: is that matter a cause or effect? Are these boys in 4-H Clubs because they like farming or because they like the 4-H Clubs?

MR. P. P. DENUNE (Ohio State University): I would also like to say a word about vocational guidance. I wonder if we mean by that

giving advice to students and children and showing them the possibilities of farming plus the possibilities of other occupations, or do we mean the taking of the youngsters in early life and directing them into farming? There is the danger. I think the guidance we need is to show the boy and girl in the country as the girl and boy in the town the possibilities the world holds in store.

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: I am wondering if Mr. Maltby won't say a word on this. There are several suggestions or testimonies in this pamphlet as to the choices of occupations by boys who had gone to agricultural schools and those who had not.

MR. MALTBY (U. S. Bureau of Vocational Education): There is a question we have been trying to study for some time, as to the influence of the type of education on the attitudes of the boys and girls toward their occupation. There has been agricultural and home economics education given in the schools and through the 4-H Clubs. In some preliminary surveys that have been made, we find that a large proportion of the vocational boys, those taking agricultural education in public schools under college grade, are going to the farm and are going to agricultural college. Particularly significant is this fact. We frequently hear the statement (and I don't want to quote hearsay evidence) that the high school is educating away from the farm. We find that the graduates of the schools in which there are vocational departments or agricultural departments have over twice as many boys who are going back on the farm than are the schools where the agricultural department is not included. That runs true through every year but the second.

We have certain guesses, of course, about the influence of agricultural education; whether it has brought to the boys the possibilities allowed them to discover means through which they can solve their problems or change their liking for farming, we do not know at this time.

PROF. ROSENLOF (University of Nebraska): I think we who are gathered here must accept the reports of this committee as having revealed a very significant factor in connection with the agricultural program for farm youth. Granted that five thousand boys and girls made reply to the questionnaire sent out under the leadership of the 4-H Club workers. Granted that the findings indicate clearly that

ninety to ninety-five per cent of those boys and girls express a willingness to return to the farm whence they have come, from which they were making their report. This is significant of the type of work that has been done by 4-H Club workers. The more significant fact to me, however, is this, that five thousand boys and girls do in no sense of the word represent anywhere near a majority of the farm boys and girls of the United States.

I want to speak on that point raised by Dr. Dunn. This is a selected group and represents the returns from such. I should like as one individual to see a study made of the twenty-five million boys and girls that belong to the rural communities.

If the work of the 4-H Club is of such significance as it is to keep boys and girls on the farm and results in the type of work it does, then it seems to me we have reached a stage in our work when there must be a more closely organized and more highly cooperative scheme worked out whereby the Department of Agriculture, State Departments and State Agricultural Colleges and educational interests of the United States—Federal, State, County and otherwise—may come together in a larger, more magnanimous sort of program than the kind we have at the present time. As an educator or one thinking in terms of education, I plead for closer cooperation between those two agencies that we may help in solving the problem which I think 4-H Clubs are solving in small measure to the group they have, which they can solve to a larger degree if they work with people interested in education.

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: I wonder if we might hear from one other bit of evidence and these suggestions will be passed on to the smaller groups where it will be possible to go into them much more fully.

There was a small study, but a significant one, made on why those who have left the country did so, and I will ask Miss Rosalind Jewett, Assistant Secretary of the American Country Life Association, if she will summarize the returns from these questionnaires.

MISS JEWETT: In order to learn the attitude toward the farm of the next older group than those reached by the first questionnaire, answers to six questions were secured from one hundred and forty-five men and women brought up on the farm and now working in the cities. The number of men answering was thirty-five and the num-

ber of women answering one hundred and five. Of course, the number is very small, but still the data may be of interest to you. The reason for leaving the farm mentioned the largest number of times by the men and within one count by the women was "To finish my education," fifteen or forty-two per cent of the men and twenty-seven or twenty-five per cent of the women giving this reason.

"Wanted a city life" was the reason mentioned by the next larger number of men. This was mentioned by two per cent of the men and only four-tenths of a per cent by the women.

The reason given the largest number of times by the women for leaving was to earn a living, a very significant point. Evidently, approximately one-fourth of the one hundred and five women reporting found no place in the economic arrangement of the farm home. Fourteen per cent of the men left for economic reasons. Not one of the one hundred and five women answering mentioned lack of conveniences as a reason for their leaving.

To the question "Are you glad you left the farm?" eighty per cent of the men replying said they were glad, and twenty per cent that they were sorry. To the question, "If you had the choice to make again, knowing what you do now, would you live on a farm or in the city?" seventy per cent of the men voted for the city as against thirty per cent for the country.

Of the women, eighty-three per cent were glad they left the farm and seventeen per cent were sorry. On making the choice again, forty per cent only would live in the city and sixty per cent would stay on the farm.

Adjustments needed in farm life to save the coming generation the problems these young men and women had to face were given as follows in the order of the number of times mentioned: Men: Better educational advantages, more social life, more recreation, increased financial returns, better living conditions. That takes in only the five mentioned a number of times. Women: Better educational advantages, more social advantages, more conveniences for the home, good roads, good libraries, financial returns.

Two said that conditions could not be changed to make farm living satisfactory and five said that these changes were already under way and were so improved over the time that they left the

farm that they would now consider the farm a satisfactory place to live.

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: There is one other question that has kept coming up over and over again, the population question, the number of people that are there, where they are, whether there are too many of them, and I wish Dr. Galpin would speak, if he would, to the question of the numerical aspect of this problem.

DR. GALPIN (Bureau of Agricultural Economics): I think that the two-page releases which the Bureau of the Census has just sent us you will need to put with your Bible of farm youth and keep ready for constant reference during your sessions. You will notice by the heading that the Bureau of the Census through the courtesies of Director Stewart and Mr. Leon Truesdell, who is chief statistician for population, we have a special release for this convention of previously unprinted statistics on farm population. The first page contains, however, some material already printed but the second page contains information that is already in the press and will be issued in a monograph soon. This monograph has been put together by Dr. Truesdell and is a very detailed exposition of the farm population of the United States as it appeared in 1920 and it seems to me that every one of you who desires to have a discriminating interest in rural problems and a discriminating judgment on broad rural problems in the United States will certainly wish to have this monograph. It is a small edition and it is put forth and made available at a nominal price.

It is my part in this conference to place the statistics of farm youth before you, at least to the extent of showing how many farm youth there are in the United States, State by State, and what part of the total youth of the nation the farm youth are. The sources of my figures are the reports of the Bureau of Census for 1920 and for some of the most significant figures I am indebted to these advance sheets, through the courtesy of Director Stewart and Dr. Truesdell. It is thought, and I concur in this, that the figures of 1920, the latest available figures for the special age groups of farm youth will serve without serious error for the situation at the present time due to several factors, the most important of which is the fact that during the past four years net losses of farm population through migration to city has kept the total farm population probably about

where it was in 1920. Farm youth will be considered as made up of two age groups: first, from ten to fourteen years. When I say ten to fourteen, I mean ten through fourteen. Second, from fifteen to nineteen years, and that means through nineteen years.

I will attempt to show you where these groups are and in what numbers. I shall ask you to hold in memory, however, two or three facts and I think that these facts are not given in the release. They are in the monograph. They were left out of the release on account of lack of space. I want you to hold these in memory and that will make my task lighter today.

One fact is that the farm boys exceed somewhat the farm girls in every State in the age group ten to fourteen. In the age group fifteen to nineteen, in every state except South Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, where the girls are slightly in excess. I mean the girls are slightly in excess according to the census of 1920. I don't know that I ought to stop to give a reason for that. There is just one guess I have, that is, when those enumerations were made there were some girls from the city picking cotton in these cotton states and they were included. I ought not, probably, to make that much of a comment.

If, therefore, you keep this general fact in mind, it will not be necessary for me to give you the farm figures by sex because you will divide it by two and make a little addition for the number of males.

The second fact is this: The age group ten to fourteen of farm youth contains in the United States four million odd persons, while the age group, fifteen to nineteen, of farm youth contains three million odd persons, and in each state the younger group is in excess of the older—about twenty per cent of the older group. I think the younger group is not given in the release but will be found in the monograph. It will not be necessary for me to give you the figures, state by state, for the younger group, for you can if you desire add about twenty per cent or one-fifth of the number of the older group to itself and you will come close to having the number in the younger group. The relation of the number of the younger age group of farm youth to the total number of youth of that age in the nation will follow closely the relation of the older age group. Those two things I ask you to bear in mind in your discussion.

Dr. Galpin then presented detailed information and interpreted the Census Bureau release which is as follows:

Washington, D. C., November 11, 1926.—The Department of Commerce announces that the farm population on January 1, 1920, included 3,289,414 persons 15 to 19 years of age, inclusive. This group of farm youth formed 34.9 per cent of the whole number of persons 15 to 19 years of age in the United States (9,430,556) and 10.4 per cent of the total farm population (31,614,269).

These figures represent a part of the results of a special tabulation of the farm population data, giving more detailed classifications than those embodied in the regular reports of the 1920 census. They are made public at this time primarily for the benefit of the Farm Youth Conference, held under the auspices of the American Country Life Association, at Washington, November 10 to 14, 1926.

The following table gives the distribution of the whole farm population by age, thus affording a sort of background against which to consider the data for the group 15 to 19 years of age.

TABLE 1

TOTAL AND FARM POPULATION OF THE UNITED STATES, BY AGE: 1920

Age	Total Population	Farm Population		Per cent Distribution, by age	
		Number	Per cent of total	Total Population	Farm Population
All ages	105,710,620	31,614,269	29.9	100.0	100.0
Under 5 years	11,573,230	4,003,330	34.6	10.9	12.7
5 to 9 years	11,398,075	4,134,740	36.3	10.8	13.1
10 to 14 years	10,641,137	4,003,006	37.6	10.1	12.7
15 to 19 years	9,430,556	3,289,414	34.9	8.9	10.4
20 to 24 years	9,277,021	2,503,932	27.0	8.8	7.9
25 to 34 years	17,157,684	4,042,936	23.6	16.2	12.8
35 to 44 years	14,120,838	3,539,105	25.1	13.4	11.2
45 to 54 years	10,498,493	2,833,731	27.0	9.9	9.0
55 to 64 years	6,531,672	1,841,610	28.2	6.2	5.8
65 years and over	4,933,215	1,403,797	28.5	4.7	4.4
Age not reported	148,699	18,668	...	0.1	0.1

The farm population, as the term was defined for use in the 1920 census, includes all persons actually living on farms without regard to occupation, and also the families of farm laborers who, while not living on a farm, nevertheless live outside the limits of any incorporated place.

The total number of persons in the United States 15 to 19 years of age, inclusive, on the date of the Fourteenth census, together with the number in the farm population and the percentage which these form of the total, is presented by states in the following table:

TABLE 2

PERSONS 15 TO 19 YEARS OF AGE IN THE TOTAL POPULATION AND IN THE FARM POPULATION: 1920

Division and State	In the Total Population	In the Farm Population		Division and State	In the Total Population	In the Farm Population	
		Number	Per Cent of Total			Number	Per Cent of Total
U. S.	9,430,556	3,289,414	34.9	So. Atl., *ctd.*:			
N. Eng.:				Va.	234,360	115,053	49.1
Maine	63,860	17,350	27.2	W. Va.	141,311	53,250	37.7
N. H.	35,152	5,820	16.6	N. Car.	268,198	162,391	60.5
Vt.	29,508	11,406	38.7	S. Car.	182,761	121,422	66.4
Mass.	302,131	9,600	3.2	Ga.	307,549	190,153	61.8
R. I.	51,655	1,258	2.4	Fla.	91,837	31,023	33.8
Conn.	106,832	7,731	7.2	E. So. Cen.:			
Mid. Atl.:				Ky.	235,824	138,255	58.6
N. Y.	817,699	65,927	8.1	Tenn.	238,371	136,995	57.5
N. J.	255,161	13,056	5.1	Ala.	244,993	147,427	60.2
Pa.	742,737	94,928	12.8	Miss.	192,199	141,652	73.7
E. No. Cen.:				W. So. Cen.:			
Ohio	464,654	107,188	23.1	Ark.	183,852	127,402	69.3
Ind.	254,204	87,522	34.4	La.	188,305	90,139	47.9
Ill.	540,552	110,495	20.4	Okla.	209,335	114,931	54.9
Mich.	295,514	76,798	26.0	Texas	488,559	259,639	53.1
Wis.	238,132	93,880	39.4	Mountain:			
W. No. Cen.:				Mont.	42,028	17,664	42.0
Minn.	219,609	96,796	44.1	Idaho	38,319	19,260	50.3
Iowa	214,981	97,728	45.5	Wyo.	14,780	5,812	39.3
Mo.	307,163	123,202	40.1	Colo.	78,632	24,964	31.7
N. Dak. ...	61,454	39,432	64.2	N. Mex. ...	34,660	16,720	48.2
S. Dak.	59,476	35,634	59.9	Ariz.	28,435	8,959	31.5
Nebr.	119,052	58,735	49.3	Utah	43,373	15,902	36.7
Kan.	162,691	73,961	45.5	Nev.	4,977	1,273	25.6
So. Atl.:				Pacific:			
Del.	18,572	5,218	28.1	Wash.	106,485	26,276	24.7
Md.	130,997	28,941	22.1	Ore.	62,775	19,324	30.8
Dis. of Col..	33,526	335	1.0	Calif.	243,326	40,587	16.7

Note.—The figures given above are taken from advance sheets of a monograph on the Farm Population of the United States, which is soon to be published by the Bureau of the Census. Further information with regard to this monograph may be obtained by addressing the Director of the Census, Washington, D. C., who will be glad to have the names of all persons interested in the subject of farm population.

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: We would like to hear from Dr. Brim, of Ohio State University, in light of the discussion of the morning in

regard to the lack of cultural opportunities and the inequality of educational opportunities.

DR. BRIM: The thing that has interested me in the discussion is the purpose that seems to be motivating much of the discussion here. It seems to me from the data gathered and from the points made that so many of you are primarily concerned in discovering the criticisms that boys and girls have to make of the farm in order that you may know what to remove, in order that you may keep the rest of them there. That is, there seems to be a tendency to be concerned with these criticisms not as reflecting fundamental shortcomings but as reflecting obstacles that tend to have boys and girls leave. There is a place for the farm youth, an attitude to know what the farm youth likes and what he doesn't like on the farm. We have to start with that and we have to work with him, but if we are merely concerned in doing away with the things he doesn't like as a means of keeping him there, we have a very meager vision and a very limited goal.

It seems to me from the standpoint of education what we ought to attempt to do is to work for and visualize a life in the country that is equal to the best. If we are going to work for life in the country equal to the best, present satisfaction may be our greatest problem. I lived on the farm and the thing that concerns me is sometimes the things they are satisfied with because the things they are satisfied with are the obstacles to their attaining or realizing a better type of life for themselves and their families. If we set up with our educational problem to realize in the country a human product equal to the best, then we will have a larger task before us and one which seems to concern us primarily here this morning, namely, to find out what the country child doesn't like and is forcing him to leave. If we were concerned in realizing in the country a human product equal to the best, it would help us to overcome what I think are some of our mistakes in working with certain agencies.

One mistake we make from the educational point of view is to mistake means for ends. I am thinking now of the early work in club work and some of what has been said here this morning. Club work ought to be primarily concerned in developing boys and

girls by means of farm and home activities, by means of questions of production, dressmaking, canning, and so forth, but too frequently we are primarily concerned in turning out better dresses and farmers and better farms and better crops. We make the mistake of thinking of ourselves in terms of efficiency experts instead of educators. The efficiency expert is concerned with a better product; the educator is concerned with better people, and we should conceive our job in terms of turning out better people. The tendency in the club work to measure its value somewhat in terms of the number of children it keeps on the farm, shows it is not being used primarily as an educative instrument for all farm children but merely for certain farm children.

Another mistake that is sometimes made in our thinking (I am speaking from the standpoint of education) is to think if we get the means we will get the end. I am thinking now of those working for better farm income. I happen to be supporting a farm now and I know it is not producing any income. I have brothers and I know they need more money and I know you cannot have better schools and better equipment and more books and a radio and victrola and all that goes for culture without having money. But the other is not true, that if you have money you will have these things. In education we have taught children to read and we are just beginning to teach them to like to read and to want to read the right things.

The same thing is true of leisure. It isn't a matter of furnishing folks more leisure but a matter of teaching them how to use their leisure. Not the folks who have the most money are the most virtuous but oftentimes the most vile. So it isn't enough to give the means and assume you will get the end. I have three brothers on the farm and the one having the smallest income is, I believe, leading the best life.

From the standpoint of our whole program, let's think from the educational point of view in terms of turning out human beings as good as those produced anywhere. Let us think of utilizing the things the country has to offer in terms of its educational, human return and not in terms of its return to the physical conditions of farm life. If human beings aren't worth more than the physical

features of farm life, then our game isn't worth the candle. We are losing our human vision in helping us attain the means of realizing better beings.

From that point of view, I want to call your attention to what I find you neglect, that is, the school program. The school aims directly at modifying the quality of human life on the farm. It is the one main educational institution. Its present situation is inferior to that of the city.

The data on teaching equipment, supervision, length of time, preparation of teacher and all the rest has been before you earlier. The thing which is not so clearly and readily appreciated is the fact that the rural mental diet which we call the curriculum is likewise inferior to that which city or urban children are given. The data lies in the course of study and the kind of teaching that goes on. The needs from that point of view relate first to the secondary field and second to the primary. What can we do from the standpoint of education to make the rural high school a better place for all farm youth? I find that so many of you folks are thinking of the farm youth that are going to stay on the farm and what you can do for them. You are not going to be that selfish and think only of them. What we have to do is create rural educational instruments that will give to every farm youth, wherever he wants to go, the best sort of education he can possibly get. The question of guidance has come up. It is a form of slavery. We are practicing it just as truly as anybody in the past has done if we attempt unduly to control the place where this child shall spend his life.

What we must consider is farm children, not the future farmer. If we could do nothing else but help these children see clearly where they can best spend their lives, we would have justified our existence.

These reports from the 4-H Club people and the others remind me very much of asking a blind man and a deaf man whether they would rather go to a musical or a picture show. They don't know as clearly as they should, and for us to draw deductions from a group blind on one side is poor logic, to say the least. So we must institute honestly a program of unselfish guidance for rural children, seeking just as much to give the one who is not going to stay

a chance to go prepared for the work he can do best as those who are going to stay with us.

So many have asked me if I believe in vocational agriculture. Of course I do. But I am concerned in turning out not primarily a person technically efficient but an intelligent, broad-minded agriculturist. There is no vocation in the world that is so complex, so fundamental, so involved and involving so many intimate, social, intellectual problems as agriculture. One could teach agriculture in a way that would make a broad-minded, intelligent, cultured gentleman, if we are concerned primarily in the kind of human being we are turning out on all sides rather than from the standpoint of turning out a farmer.

May I turn to the elementary school for just a moment. The high school problem and adult problem is a product of the elementary school. The tendency on your part to neglect the elementary school is just as short-sighted as it can be. Years ago we tried to improve social conditions in the country by all sorts of superficial remedial measures applied to the adult criminal. We know that doesn't pay now judged by results; we have to deal with causes and you folks have to deal with the causes of your rural problem and the cause lies down the grades with the children, not in the high school. If we could have in the country first-class elementary schools, fifty per cent of the problems would vanish overnight. As long as we have the present elementary school as it is, the product of that school will defy your efforts because you are dealing with a type of person who has already been in the large measure spoiled. So I beg of you, if you are really concerned in your own problem, look at it in a large way and get busy on the education provided for children.

There are just two things especially with reference to the curriculum where I think our thinking is likely to go astray more than anywhere else. There are just these two things I invite you to cooperate with us in doing: First, to use two terms stated yesterday: To psychologize the elementary school curriculum. That means to teach the child in relation to and by means of his daily life. To utilize his nature experiences, to utilize his farm and home activities, to utilize and relate to his experiences the things that we

want to teach him that lie beyond his experience. But our purpose there is not to ruralize, not to center his attention unduly upon the farm but to teach him wisely, by means of his experience; in that respect, we do not differ from any other school.

The second thing is to socialize the curriculum. That means we must teach the child nature studies by means of nature. He then comes to have a larger interest in the scientific activities of the world. We should teach him by means of his dealing with animals and plants something about the history of the development of domesticated animals. If we start with local geography, we may reach out. We wouldn't wish to circumscribe the mental horizon or social sympathy or intellectual span of any rural child, yet that is what we do if we do not carefully guard our tendency to want the elementary school to be an instrument for ruralizing this rural child.

There is one other thing I want to call your attention to in this connection. Many of you folks are aware of (and we readily admit it) the abstract nature of the present elementary school. We are doing what we can to improve it. You folks in response to that situation have instituted other service agencies. I am thinking of the club work which is organized outside the school. It is a big addition but as long as this club work exists out of relationship to the work in the elementary school, it is always going to be doing a difficult task because it isn't influencing the major educational agency. Furthermore, the things that are being done outside the school in the way of club work are in a sense keeping the elementary school from making progress. What I think we ought to do is to integrate the club work and school work in order that elementary education of a better sort may be realized in order that your problem of dealing with the high school boy and rural adult may be made more easy.

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: We have, as Mrs. Cook perhaps could tell us in just a moment, Bulletins 18, 19 and 21, among our material that give rather definite indications as to the retardations of schools and so on. One thing I want is to be sure we know our resources in the way of material while we are working here together.

Mrs. Cook (Bureau of Education): Those of us interested primarily in educational facilities for children in rural communities felt if we confined ourselves to statistical and objective evidence we would miss in our discussion the very crux of the situation concerned with educating rural children. So we decided to give our time to Dr. Brim to tell you the things he has told you which we think bring out the real problems rather than the things more or less immaterial that can be set up in statistical evidence and objective data. Consequently, we have decided not to take the time to discuss the evidence contained in these circulars that are in your envelopes but let you take them with you. If you want to bring them up in the group discussions, all right, or take them along to think about as you wish.

There is also shown a very wide difference in the achievement measured by the standard texts. We have put up some of the evidence here which you can take along showing that rural children are from a year to a year and a half behind city children as measured by standard tests.

If you wish to ask questions all right. If you wish further data, we will be glad to send it to you if you will write to the Bureau of Education at any time for it.

Chairman Elliott: We would like to hear from Mr. Maltby of the Federal Bureau of Vocational Guidance any comment he wishes to make on this aspect of the discussion.

Mr. Maltby: The problem has been brought up several times. A good many of our farm boys and girls are obliged to migrate, at least some of them must leave the farm. I think that there should be a problem presented here to this group today and tomorrow as to how those groups may be divided and if some guidance may not be given those groups in their educational work, primarily in vocational education. The vocational people, for instance, would like to know to what extent is the choice of the vocation and the success in the vocation related to these other problems of economics, social and religious.

As to vocational education itself, it does seem to me those boys and girls who are going to remain on the farm (and I dare say that in some areas ninety-five per cent is not all wrong by any

means) should be given the type of education that can help them solve the problems that they must solve in farming if they are going to be successful and happy. That is the largest problem of vocational education today. We are concerned in education and the vocational aspects of education with those boys and those girls, giving them the type of education that will help solve those problems.

What the vocational group would like to know and bring out is to what extent it has met that field; to what extent it can meet it in enlarging its activities.

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: There was one other big section of material this morning that had to do with health facilities, as to whether or not the boy or girl in the country really is at disadvantage in regard to certain facilities and in the whole health area. I would like to call on Dr. Lumsden of the U. S. Public Health Service, to indicate what would be true as to the relative situation between country and city or town in regard to health conditions.

DR. LUMSDEN: From studies made of the physical condition of urban and rural children and young adults in the United States, a large mass of figures has been made available. Only a small proportion of the data, however, is sufficiently specific to be helpful in an effort to reach a definite conclusion about the relative and absolute physical status of young persons who have been raised on farm homes.

In undertaking to arrive at some estimate of the physical status of farm youth, consideration will be given to the following: 1. The rural and urban death rates from all causes and from certain type diseases. 2. The records of physical examination of children and young adults in rural and urban communities. 3. The environmental sanitary conditions in rural and urban districts. 4. Rural and urban health service. 5. What can be done to make country life of the future much more healthful than city life of the present.

Data are available showing the annual death rates from all causes and from certain type diseases per 100,000 of population in the rural and the urban districts of the registration area of the United States for the period 1900 to 1924, inclusive. These figures are from the mortality statistics of the United States Census Bureau. The registration area comprised about 40.5% of our total popula-

tion in 1900, and about 88.4% in 1924. In these statistics, the term "cities" includes cities with populations of 10,000 or over, and "rural" includes open country, villages, towns, and cities, with populations under 10,000. The death rate from all causes for each year within this period has been lower in the rural than in the urban population. This fact taken alone might suggest that rural life is longer and, in general, healthier than urban life.

The decline in the death rate, however, has been in this quarter of a century greater among the urban than among the rural population. On a basis of 1,000 population, the average annual rates for the first five years and the last five years of the period were as follows:

	1900-1904	*1920-1924*	*Decline*
Cities	17.74	13.00	4.74
Rural	14.25	11.23	3.02
Difference	3.49	1.77	1.72

The greater decline in the urban rate probably has been due mainly to the better progress in sanitation and in more efficient health service in the cities with populations over 50,000. The age factor may have operated to some extent because the drift of population from country to city presumably involves the young more than it does the old.

It is important to note that the rural death rate is higher than the urban from malaria and influenza throughout the period, from typhoid fever for the last 16 years, and from tuberculosis of the respiratory tract for the last 4 years.

The relatively high prevalence of such communicable and preventable diseases in our rural population emphasizes the need of more efficient health service in our rural districts.

According to findings from studies made by Leach and Maxcy [1] in Alabama, the typhoid fever morbidity and mortality rates in the open country districts of that state—and, inferentially, of some other states—are very much lower than the rates in the villages, small towns, and small cities (with populations ranging from 500 to 10,000), and are as low as the rates in the large and relatively well-sanitated cities (with populations over 25,000).

[1] Public Health Reports, Vol. 41, No. 16, April 16, 1926, pp. 705-710.

Most of the communities now presenting strategic points for sanitary attack upon typhoid fever and upon a number of other preventable diseases would be included within the scope of activities of well-organized, whole-time county health departments, were such departments established to a reasonably adequate extent.

The voluminous records of physical examination of school children and young adults, which are available, should furnish definite data on the physical status of farm youth, but in most of the records the persons examined are grouped as urban or rural—rural including villages and small towns and small cities.

Howe[2] has made an interesting record of the physical examination of 595,206 school children in New York State in the school year 1922-23. His classification is cities, villages with over 4,500 population, and rural. Thus "rural" in his records includes villages with populations up to 4,500. Of the 595,206 children examined, 229,730, or 38.5 per cent, were reported as normal. These, with the percentages of those examined, were reported from the following sources:

	Number reported normal	*Percentage*
Cities	77,918	38.0
Large villages	34,331	44.6
Rural schools	117,481	37.4

Children classified as normal were those found not to be suffering with any defect that interfered with their normal physical or mental progress in school. The percentage found with physical defects was slightly larger for rural children than for city children and considerably larger than for the village school children. As "rural" in this report includes villages with populations up to 4,500, the figures do not furnish a basis for comparison of the physical status of farm children with urban children.

Love and Davenport[3] in a detailed study of defects found in drafted men report a "defect rate" of 609 per 1,000 for urban registrants and 528 per 1,000 for rural registrants. They classify

[2] Howe, W. A.: School Medical Inspection in New York State, Amer. Journal of Public Health, Vol. XV, No. 4, Apr. 1925, pp. 305-309.

[3] Love, A. G., and Davenport, C. B.: Defects Found in Drafted Men, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1920, p. 51.

as "rural" those from villages, towns, and cities with populations up to 25,000. Therefore, their figures do not indicate the comparative physical status of registrants from farm homes.

Wood [4] has compiled records of physical examination of over 500,000 school children, rural and urban, in many different parts of the United States. His compilation shows a remarkably higher percentage of defects in every item of defectiveness enumerated (teeth, tonsils, adenoids, eye, ear, nutrition, glands, breathing, spine, blood, lungs, heart, and mind) for country children than for city children. In the figures used, the classification of "country" and "city" probably varies greatly.

Of 235,024 school children examined in the 89 cooperative rural (county or district) health projects of the U. S. Public Health Service [5] in the fiscal year 1926, there were found 148,318, or 63 per cent, with defects. Intensive work for the correction of physical defects has been done among this group of children, and the percentage of defectiveness is now lower than it was when the whole-time, local health services were inaugurated.[6] Of these children, about 67 per cent [7] are rural; that is, from homes in open country or in villages with populations under 2,500.

According to all the available evidence, it seems that at least 70 per cent of the school children and pre-school children in the United States would show, upon careful examination today, physical defects which handicap them in their growth and development—physical and mental—in their potential usefulness as citizens, and in their joy of living.

A large proportion of this physical defectiveness among our young people is preventable or remediable. There is no room for reasonable doubt that much more should be done than has been and is being done about this vitally important matter. The cost of practicable measures for the improvement of the physical condi-

[4] Wood, T. D.: Health Essentials for Rural School Children, Chicago, American Medical Association.
[5] Public Health Reports, Vol. 41, No. 43, Oct. 22, 1926, p. 2409.
[6] Roberts, F. L.: School Examinations Analyzed, Southern Med. Jour. (Vol. XIX, No. 8) of August, 1926, pp. 611-614.
[7] Reprint No. 1079 from Public Health Reports of May 7, 1926, p. 11.

tion of our young people is readily within the economic means of our average community.

A considerable proportion of physical defectiveness results from preventable communicable disease due to local, or home, insanitary conditions. Some of the communicable diseases are now much more prevalent in our rural districts than in our large cities.

In the course of house-to-house sanitary surveys made by the U. S. Public Health Service in 1914, 1915, and 1916,[8] it was found that of over 50,000 farm homes distributed over a wide range of our rural districts, only 1.22 per cent were provided with sanitary toilets; at 68 per cent of the homes the water supply used for drinking and cooking purposes was obviously exposed to potentially dangerous contamination; and at only 32.88 per cent were the dwellings during the summer season effectively screened to prevent flies (having free access to nearby-deposits of human and other filth) from entering dining rooms and kitchens and contaminating the foods for human consumption exposed therein.

The public health business, like any other important business, will not run itself. Some one, whose exclusive business is to look after it, should be on the job constantly in every locality. Of the approximately 2,850 counties, wholly or largely rural, in the United States, only 307 were in 1926 provided with local, public health service under the direction of whole-time, local (county or district) health officers.

The fact that over 84 per cent of our rural population is as yet unprovided with official local health service approaching adequacy is of portentous seriousness. It means that we are permitting a sacrifice of the health and lives and the material resources of many of our people every year—a sacrifice which is needless because preventable, and preventable by measures readily within our means and demonstrated to be in the highest sense economical. It clearly deserves the prompt and vigorous attention of all who are genuinely interested in our national welfare.

The view now generally accepted by official public health work administrators is that the proper foundation for reasonable, economical, and effective public health service in our rural districts is

[8] Public Health Bulletin No. 94.

the county health department under the direction of the well qualified, whole-time county health officer. Whole-time county health service is described in detail in available printed reports.[9] It promises much. It seems theoretically sound and it is successful in practice. It deserves the earnest consideration of those especially interested in country life and of all who are concerned with the welfare of all our people.

My conclusion is that country life in itself is conducive to the healthfulness of children; and that our rural districts generally, if provided with reasonably adequate local public health service under the direction of well qualified county or local district whole-time health officers, would become much healthier than they now are, and very considerably healthier than our best ordered large cities.

PRESIDENT BUTTERFIELD: I think you would feel it a great omission if we failed to take account of Armistice Day. We have no program except the posture of recognition. I think we should stand and in just a moment, with bowed heads, render our tribute. After just a moment of silence, Rev. Dr. Dana will offer a word of prayer.

After a moment of silence, Dr. Dana offered a prayer and the audience joined in singing "America."

Chairman Elliott went over the syllabus regarding the afternoon sessions.

The meeting adjourned at twelve-thirty o'clock.

[9] Cooperative Rural Health Work of the Public Health Service in the Fiscal Year 1926, Public Health Reports, Vol. 41, No. 43, pp. 2381-2420, of October 22, 1926.

Friday Morning Session

November 12, 1926

2. WHAT ARE THE SPECIAL PROBLEMS OF FARM YOUTH?

Chairman Elliott: May I say just a word about the plan suggested? After the session yesterday, the leaders and recorders of the groups met and then a committee from the leaders and recorders met still longer so that we have worked a number of hours between the afternoon session and this morning's session in trying to see how most effectively to bring together the results of yesterday's sessions.

It is suggested that we follow an outline for the morning of reporting which I will indicate as we go along, an outline which was prepared in the light of yesterday's discussion by the leaders and recorders of the groups and fortified slightly by means of a more careful examination of the written reports.

First, there was considerable consideration given in many of the groups to the matter of psychological attitude, this attitude toward farming, toward farm life, and so on. This matter of attitude divided itself into several sections. The question was raised how farm youth themselves were rather favorable to progress, to new opportunities, that the problem wasn't so much a problem of farm youth itself as in some other aspect of the farm youth problem. I think that Mr. Felton's group dealt with that. What answer would you get from your own groups as to whether this is a problem with farm youth or whether it is a problem in some other aspect, so far as making progress in relation to the country.

Mr. Rapking: I came to the conclusion after giving some thought and time and attention to it at the State Conference in

West Virginia that at least seventy-five per cent of it was an adult problem.

Mr. Landis (Federal Churches of Christ in America): In the group considering religious education, it was felt that farm youth is not in revolt against the present program for moral and religious education, that it does respond if a modern institution and program puts that appeal to it. There was agreement upon those points.

Miss Edith Allen (Office of Experiment Station, Washington): In our group, the students they knew seemed to come back home to the farms for summer. That indicated a liking for the farm though there were some students who were ashamed to say they came from farm homes.

Mr. Foster: There was a decided attitude or opinion on the part of the group that a barrier to the development of a broader social and recreational program was the attitude in the minds of the parents. That was backed up by Miss Duthie, of Cornell; in communities where they have done specialist work and sent folks in to develop attitudes for recreational programs, the attitude both on the part of the parents and young people was quite changed. There was some discussion as to whether the attitude of the youth themselves was not adverse to recreational programs. This was not supported by evidence.

Chairman Elliott: Do you want to check on this at all? The difficulty was in sympathy and understanding on the part of adult parents.

Mr. Farrell (Extension Department): We felt in our group that the idea that was expressed in the morning session that the country was rather conservative and that it had a tendency to hold back, was not entirely founded upon fact. The country people as a whole did want new things and were moving along as rapidly as it was wise for a large group of people to move.

Chairman Elliott: The reports from the groups indicated three aspects of this and I think we will spend just a few moments discussing them and seeing what you have to say about it.

First: How the farm youth themselves feel—not about the country but about any sort of forward movements in education,

health programs, recreation, and so on. Is it a case of difficulty there or meeting their needs?

Second: The attitude of parents and leaders toward youth's problems and desires.

Third: The community attitude toward and enthusiasm for health, recreation, religious education, any other sort of programs. There were a number of indications that you sometimes have a community dormant in its attitude, not caring very much about it.

MR. FELTON: One of the ministers made the point that he felt that a good many ministers in his section of the country were not sympathetic at all with youth and their organizations and gave several illustrations to show that. Others gave illustrations to show in the various social organizations that we thought of the youth as a young colt, something to watch and see what they were going to do bad, and that there was not a sympathetic attitude.

MR. FOSTER: On the question under attitudes, what to do, and that problem, one of the outstanding things brought out in the group considering recreation was the need of the development of leadership among agency groups putting on a recreational program, and second, that country youth does not know how to play co-operatively. The question of religious prejudice as a limiting factor toward development of right attitude on recreation was brought out and then the attitude on the part of adults was discussed by practically all members of the group as being a limiting factor in the development of any sort of broad, social program.

PROFESSOR DUNN: In the group considering education, it was definitely brought out that the attitude of adults toward the provision of educational facilities and toward those things toward which education was working, was a very serious hampering factor in the development of adequate education for the youth. Consequently, the group agreed that it was impossible to set one's self to consider only the education of youth, that it was essential to formulate a double program in which both education of youth and education of adults would receive very definite attention.

We felt deficiencies were traceable to past sins in educational provision and the fact that the adults of the rural communities, of farm communities, had not had commensurate educational oppor-

tunities in the past. Also, the fact that their contracts had not supplemented what their schools have been able to provide for them in the days when they were growing up, kept them from having as long and as broad a vision as would be most serviceable for the youth of their neighborhood.

MR. FARRELL: In contrast to the group which Dr. Dunn represented, the small group with which I worked took the attitude that we were making considerable progress and that though we might think we were going rather slowly, yet we were making considerable progress when we got right down and studied what was happening. Probably we had better think of this thing in terms of a long-time program. Possibly the educational machinery and various agencies working with it are not cooperating and therefore the group of rural people were rather waiting for this professional group to clear up their thinking.

DR. DUNN: That is not really in contrast. There was no denial of progress in our group. There was, in fact, a statement toward the end of the discussion that one contributing factor to rapid growth of rural communities was cooperative marketing programs which were bringing together men in relationships, made them look broader than their own individual interests, and that we might expect in the next five or six years from that agency alone a great advance.

MR. LINDEMAN (New York School of Social Work): This seems to me to be a problem so pertinent to our own consideration, I should like to spend some time at it to discover if we can out of our own experience and in relation to our own children, how it is that this hiatus between youth and age, after we eliminate some of the Freudian explanations, exists. If we can eliminate those suggestive elements and then ask ourselves how to explain this, we might discover it is our own fault. I suggest that we consider if the way science or scientific thinking is coming into the mind of youth as distinguished from the way it came into the mature mind isn't one of the chief factors which distinguishes between the world in which youth lives and the world in which adults live.

MR. FELTON: The feeling, I understand, was not lack of sympathy of the parents for youth. Several parents contended that the difficulty was with the leaders. One illustration was that of a group

of girl scouts. The girls and their parents wanted to organize the girl scouts. An organizer came out and said it had to be done a certain way in certain geographical areas. The requirements couldn't be met, and yet, the parents were sympathetic with their girls.

Another illustration. A group of Presbyterian and Methodist young people decided to organize a joint young people's society in a small village. One of the denominational officials tried to stop it and the young people went ahead and tried to do it anyhow. They received a letter from the official saying it was irregular. The parents were sympathetic in both cases to the young people's demands.

MR. TURNER: In the group discussing conditions with reference to sanitation and health, the question of attitudes also came up. A little different element was brought up, that both youth and adult had the same attitude toward health and sanitary conditions in that in both instances what was needed was an aroused public opinion.

MR. RAPKING: It may be a part of the explanation, that a good many of the adults in the country today were converted and before they were converted they were going along a certain way and with the conversion they gave up all their good times—that was all worldly. So a large number of our adults in the country now think of their experience previous to conversion as sinful.

On the other hand, I am agreed with what Mr. Felton reports, that even the leaders, not seeing the conflict that is on, not knowing how to bring in the new and add to the old and work the two together, are making mistakes and making the situation worse than it really is. I believe we are making considerable progress along that line.

MR. HALL: I think one of the big things in the lack of sympathetic viewpoint on the part of adults toward youth is the fact that they don't live with the youth. They don't associate with them, don't go to the theaters with them, don't arrange and plan their entertainment to be with the youth.

MR. HOY (Ohio Wesleyan University): I think one of the reasons why youth do not join with parents or parents do not go with the youth is the fact the older people, our parents, do not realize what

we need. They (adults) do not meet our need for a program. And when our need has been realized, they do not see it as we see it.

Mr. G. H. Montgomery (Virginia Cooperative Ass'n): One good mother, very much interested in her daughter and trying to live with her very closely, trying to understand her ways and her companions, went with her daughter to the movie or picture show, to the dance, to a number of places. Finally they were starting out one night when the daughter said to the mother, "If you will just slip out of the dance hall tonight, I'll be glad. It's all right for you to go, but we are getting tired of having you with us all the night long."

Mr. John Phelan (Michigan State College): I would like to say just a word in corroboration of what the students have brought forth. We have at Michigan State University a fact discovery course. The purpose of it is to have the student really come through and tell what he is thinking about life as a whole and his vocation.

No use whatever is made of what the student says, that is, when he talks to the person in charge of the course it is with the understanding that in no way whatever will that ever be brought forth in class. It is a very common instance that the student will say, "Now my folks are set on my doing this thing." They have already tried to do that impossible thing of shaping another's life. Our course isn't intended to shape life but rather just to help the student ask himself questions. I think there is that feeling that has been expressed this morning that the barrier between youth and age is that age wants to shape up what youth should do.

Just one other fact. I am impressed with this, as these students meet with me, that their attitude toward farming or toward medicine or toward law is practically the same. Some of them are sons of doctors and wouldn't be a doctor under any consideration. Some who have come from the farm don't want to go to the farm. Others just as frankly do and want to know how it can be done, and the influence of the home and the community, however primitive that may have been, has been the deciding factor.

Just recently I attended a meeting addressed by President John Munson of the Northern Normal School in Michigan, located at Marquette. He made a statement which may come somewhat as a

surprise. We were talking about rural teachers and the preparation of rural teachers, and President Munson got up and said this: "We do not in our normal school know the difference between rural and urban teachers. We send out what we consider to be a teacher who has to face as big a rural problem as any teacher ever had to face. She goes out ten or twelve miles in the country to logging camps and runs the school. She is just as willing to go there as to the city."

Mr. Wm. McRae (International Y. M. C. A. College, Mass.): There is one phase we haven't touched and which is fundamental. I have three boys: One in college, one just graduated from high school, one in junior high. What I would like to see done is to simplify life a bit. I can come back at my friend about not going with the boys by saying I am most sympathetic with youth, by telling them it is almost impossible to get a half hour of a boy's time who is a senior in high school. He has this thing, that thing and the other thing calling him. If you want a little of his time, you have to be quick about it. The difficulty is that life is too complex. That is fundamental.

If the girl wants mother to go out in the evening, mother very likely has been to a parent teachers' meeting (a fine thing!) and she is just a bit too tired to go there. You could name instances of that sort over and over again. If groups can get at things and simplify things for us parents and young people, at least don't add any more, and then I think we will make progress.

Dr. Ralph Adams (Country Life Dept., Reformed Church): I am not speaking for Group 10 but myself. It seems to me that the adult group, particularly leaders of youth, need to respect young people, need to respect their intelligence, their initiative. I suspect that most adult leaders like to do all the leading themselves whereas what they should do is to set free the leadership capacities in these young people. They should lead young people to lead themselves.

Mr. May (Michigan Y. M. C. A.): I have been giving all of my time to high school boys and girls. I know something about the complexity of life and I don't think we are going to make it any simpler. I think from the variety of interests that boys and girls have, they are going to be that much bigger. I think we never

will get together. I think we want to respect them more than they respect us. They are in the age of idealism. We have no right to put anything down their throat at all. I sometimes ask high school boys to get them thinking, "Have we any right at all to try to make any high school boy or girl to believe the things we believe?" The only thing I am trying to do is to give them expression. I have been working on the vocational idea and the things that fathers and mothers try to get their boys and girls to be and do are sometimes very ridiculous. Two thousand years ago there was a mother by the name of Mary that said to her son when he came out of the temple, "Why did you leave us? We have been looking three days for you and sorrowing." She didn't sail into him. She kept those things in her heart and thought them over.

Dr. C. C. Taylor (North Carolina State College): I am inclined to lay the blame on the old people. My boy says to me, "Daddy, why do you just want to work all the time?" when he wants me to do something with him. I am inclined to believe the only way the difference is going to be settled and the hiatus closed is to recognize that youth lives and insists on living a full life and that adults do not, and the reason that adults do not is because we get caught in occupational and professional work, attitudes which drive us into narrow channels. Therefore the only way the breach between us can be healed is for us to get into rural life or any other phase of life as many of those elements which will help those of us in adult life to live a more complete life, so we will be automatically on a common plane.

Chairman Elliott: Could we move from this to a question raised incidentally several times this morning in the discussion and which was raised yesterday and rather definitely discussed in some of the groups. That is the changes that are taking place in the actual community areas themselves and the effect that is having upon the farm youth problem and farm youth situation, and the extent to which there is a breakup of the smaller community units and a tendency to form new and larger units. I wish that in opening that Mr. Lindeman would be willing to report on his own group on that question.

Mr. Lindeman: I am not sure our group went to the second

phase but we did discuss and rather agreed that the most uniform trend discoverable in rural life was that the small community units are now dispersing. They disperse first on a level of economic interest. They disperse next, perhaps, on the level of recreation or entertainment through the introduction of specialized forms of amusement like the motion pictures which cannot exist in the smaller community but can in the somewhat larger one. The smaller community is going out to wider areas for amusement and step by step there seemed to be about nine different ways in which the small rural district was dispersing rather than disintegrating. Henceforth, we are no longer dealing with the same social organization or social grouping or social structure, but we are probably dealing with a new rural type of mind which makes its contacts in a much wider area than the older type American rural farming community. Our only suggestion was if this trend is accepted as an actual picture of what seems to be occurring uniformly, then the obligation of the agencies is to revamp their program, to reconstruct their hypothesis about rural life in terms of the changing situation.

Mr. Felton: In our group (considering religious education) the automobile came in for discussion. The point made was the roads and the automobiles had enlarged the small neighborhood and made of it a part of a larger community.

One gentleman from Maine or Massachusetts, one of those progressive provinces, told us of a larger parish, ten miles wide and thirty-five miles long, in which there were three directors, one having to do with religious work, one with religious education, and one with social life. There are different denominations supporting this one large parish. He gave that as illustration of the way the adjustment was being made.

A lady from Illinois gave a suggestion about the enlarging of the religious educational work, including something like sixteen parishes, under one paid director. I think we had four of these directors there. They showed us how this was a way of making the little neighborhood a part of this larger area. All of these directors were working and paid by denominations but they worked in many small churches of that denomination. I suppose there is no wiping out denominational lines in the year 1926.

MR. MANNING (Maine Universalist Convention): There are in that Maine experiment the Ox Bow United Parish, as we call it, churches of three denominations and ministers of two denominations. When you look at them you can't tell the difference.

A part of the program of that larger parish is the bringing in of the better class movies to the parish and showing them in the small communities. Arrangements have been made with the moving picture producers and distributors so that this can be done economically and the parish provides a family ticket so that no matter how large the family is it can get into the movie at a reasonable charge—twenty-five cents for adults and sixty cents for a whole family.

MISS ALLEN: In our group, it was stated that transportation and club camps had brought town and country people together in such a way it showed the town people what country boys and girls look like and that this influence had raised people's estimation of farm folk.

MISS EMERSON (Maryland Girls Club Work): In the group which discussed recreation, a student from West Virginia brought out the point that in some communities they have a community council where one member from even the baseball team and all the other teams come together to form a community program. Over and over again in the discussion of the group, there was brought out the need for the community program, that the specialist from the college on recreation should hold institutes with the representative of each agency group to work out a community program which will prevent overlapping. One person told of a place where eighteen different organizations were competing for the time of the small community of people for recreation.

MR. DENUNE: There is another phase of this changing rural community. We have been talking about its effect. In group 1, considering farm income, it was brought out clearly that changes in transportation and communication were not only broadening the community but also bringing the whole community into economic competition with much wider area than formerly, so that there must be constant readjustment of the farming itself, of the crops, to meet the changed situation. New markets make it impossible for a farmer to make a living fairly by the traditional method and using tradi-

tional crops. There must be a revamping of the crop program in order to meet the new situation.

MR. LINDEMAN: I just want to suggest that one of the items susceptible of research which some may want to follow up is the more or less general knowledge that the country bank is going out of existence. If that is true, then the control of credit is also moving out of the rural community and is being focused in urban communities and the old intimate relation in which the farmer became acquainted with his banker and banking and credit problems is now dropping out of the equation of rural life. That is one point which we can attack by objective research.

MISS MERRILL: The solution of the rural library problem, whereby a large unit supports one good library, is not a serious one. Over two hundred counties in the United States have provided library service for every nook and cranny of the country. It has brought the biggest change in rural book service.

MISS CHARLOTTE HICKMAN (Rural Pastor, California): There has come to me a question as to whether we are gradually drifting to the place where our primary unit for consideration will be rather the community instead of the home because our interests are taking our younger people outside the home in many communities. If that is true, I think it will materially affect our plans and programs for the future. If we are planning on the basis of community rather than home, it lays added responsibility on all the agencies.

MISS ROELOFS (National Board of the Y. W. C. A.): It doesn't seem to me a question of either the very small community or the large community but the interaction of both. In the Y. W. C. A. we have been making a study for three years of relationships of city and country. There are certain values which come from the larger group. There are certain contacts which bring value which you never can get in your small community group which the young women know most about and the adult women need.

Over and above this value which comes through the larger contact, there are two other points that I think are very, very important. One is that if you take the large area, you are apt to get leadership and finance right there in your own locality and you don't have to depend on being subsidized by a state or national

group for your budget or your leadership. I know there are certain parts of the country being considered by the church as the home missionary field. I think it is bad for people's character development to feel they have to have money from the outside for voluntary educational work. By taking the larger unit, you are apt to find by putting the larger town with the open country, you are going to have money and leadership for your work.

In one place where we were organizing two or three organizations, they told us, "That is the home missionary field; you are crazy to think of raising your budget."

Our work has to be self-initiating, but we took a unit which was large enough and therefore we got local support. The little communities began to have a respect for themselves and develop more community feeling bcause they felt they were making contributions. Instead of losing the small field we strengthened it. But those women got contact with different nationalities, different outlooks on life, so they have the contact which has prepared them for the broader life which people now have to live.

Mr. C. B. Martin (Extension Service, Dept. of Agriculture): I want to speak a word in regard to California. The community is not the fundamental unit of civilization. The home is the fundamental unit of all civilized society. The power which readjusts the world originates in the home and the home controls the viewpoint of the man. The Chief Scout of the world, speaking in this building during this year said: "The British statistics prove that a boy's destiny as far as crime is concerned is decided between the ages of eight and twelve." That is the reason fathers and mothers in the country are conservative. They realize their destiny. When we think of the home as a fundamental unit, it is easier to readjust all of these changes and easy enough to meet it. Absolutely, I confess to thinking the fundamental units first.

It has been said by the man who put many of us into extension work that the country home, if it has a father and mother of sense, is better endowed for the training of youth.

Dr. True (United States Dept. of Agriculture): There is another side to this change that I think ought to be considered, namely, the rise and rapid spread of the cooperative movement among the farm-

ing people and the formation of larger and larger cooperatives. There is coming about a class consciousness of the farm people which will have to be taken into account when all these matters are gone into, and more and more the leaders among the farm people will insist that the farm people themselves be taken into account in the organization of welfare agencies and the community affairs in general. While the country people are dealing more and more with the village and city populations, they will not as in the past simply be willing to imitate and follow the leadership of the people living in those larger communities.

PROFESSOR DUNN: In our group considering education it was very definitely recognized that the large unit was valuable both from the educational values coming from its wide social contacts and also from administrative and financial points of view. On the other hand, the point was reiterated again and again that it was extremely interested in thinking of the group, to think of it in its parts and to be sure that any program is adjusted and takes into consideration all the parts. The group specified the community as being composed of children from the ages birth to five years, five years to twelve years, twelve years to adulthood and expressing the necessity of adapting any statement of educational preference and any plan of educational program to the needs of the respective groups.

It went even further than that and emphasized again and again the necessity of adaptation and taking into consideration the individual, whether child or adult. There was all through the conception that we have before us the preference of realizing the individual and his potentiality and his possibilities and that any program which forgets the individual or small group is on the wrong track.

MR. ADAMS: The group that I represent is group 8 on religious work. The question was brought up concerning the literature available for our country churches. I think what we need from our denominational boards, from the larger overhead organizations, interdenominational as well as denominational, is a decided consideration of the small organization in the country and the special background, the spiritual background which is available to country people. Not enough use is made of those facts and I feel that many of the pro-

grams, much of the literature that is prepared for our church work and the Sunday school work is prepared for the large, ideal congregation, usually found in the city.

Miss Elliott (Religious Education): All I can do is second what Mr. Adams has said. I work mostly in the Methodist Church but in a number of community churches also. The thing I am finding as I work is just what was brought out—all the material is made for the city church and all the life situations are from a city point of view. The thing we need is based on life situations familiar to the country folk and the youth of the farm and also the teacher training material needs to be simplified and put in form.

Professor Dunn: May I speak as an individual, not representative of a group? I do want to express something not brought out in our group, that exactly the need expressed here for rural churches exists in the rural school. There are in the United States one hundred and sixty-five thousand one-teacher schools which are educating or trying to educate over four million children. There is absolutely no educational material made for this very large group. Very recently, a national agency has been organizing certain curriculum material primarily for the one-teacher school. That material was brought to my attention the other day and I gave it to a prominent person in the field of education to criticize. This person was very enthusiastic and said it was fine material. "How can we get it in all our schools?" I said. "You don't want to get it into all your schools. It is meant for one-teacher schools." The person immediately looked sympathetic. "Why in the world did you organize that material for the one-teacher school? Why didn't you organize it for the consolidated schools?"

The point I made is just the point made over here. The other schools have more leadership available, are better able to make their full adaptation. Here is the first thing that I know of, that a general agency has made for the one-teacher schools and it was criticized because it was adapted to their special needs.

Mr. Shinn: I am reporting for Group 3, which was concerned with vocational facilities and vocational preparation for farm youth. The group was strongly of the opinion that the existing facilities are not sufficient to offer opportunity for vocational training to all

rural and farm youth, that is, the vocational schools were not sufficient in scope and the extension work in its present form was not able to reach all of the farm youth to give vocational training. So the group felt there should be at least one Smith-Hughes school in every County of the United States; that there should be greater facilities offered to extension work, greater leadership through club work and possibly county agent work. There was a feeling that greater stress should be placed on the better type of rural school and the high school of one, two, three or four years' work which was not teaching Smith-Hughes work.

Dr. Taylor: I have talked with the leader of the students and they have a definite contribution.

Mr. Kitchen (Penn. State College): I was waiting for you to come to it. We have a problem to present rather than any contribution to the solution of it. In our discussion this morning we felt the problem of leadership is central. We can handle the other problems which we listed in large numbers if we have adequate leadership. We felt that the college is not doing all it can do to furnish that leadership: first, that the curriculum is not sufficiently adapted to the specific needs of the rural community; second, that the atmosphere of the college campus is not conducive to the preparation of rural leaders. In other words, we find the campus unfriendly sometimes to the farm group and we felt we needed a curriculum adapted to our needs and a rural atmosphere in which a rural youth could grow.

Chairman Elliott: It has been suggested that in dividing up this afternoon into five groups, that, for example, not all of the extension workers should be in one group but that literally they should be scattered so that some of the church workers mingle with the recreation group and vice versa. At the beginning of the afternoon session we will check up and find out whether we are distributed rightly.

It has been suggested the whole question of vocational development and preparation should be one group but that it should include people from other aspects of it, people interested in the moral and religious development, and so on with the other groups.

The success of the afternoon depends upon our not huddling together in one group but actually seeing to it that there are representatives of the agencies actually dealing with each question in each group.

Saturday Morning Session

November 13, 1926

3. WHAT SHOULD BE DONE?

The meeting convened at nine o'clock, Dr. Elliott presiding.

Chairman Elliott: We have gone over the reports of the groups that met yesterday afternoon, the leaders and recorders spending considerable time last evening working over the material and then went over it afterward with others. There seemed to be eight points on which we might focus attention this morning.

I would like to just indicate to you what they are and start at once to cover them so we will not feel we have not done our duty if they are not brought into the discussion this morning.

The first question that came up was fruitful methods of participation on the part of adults and youth. Several of the groups worked upon that. They worked also upon a second question under it—the extent to which and the ways in which youth should participate in the actual development of program and organization. What part should they have in that?

The second question was, how determine the results you desire or the things you want to accomplish.

The third problem—One or two of the groups spoke on what we are after. Do we differ as to objectives?

The fourth problem was around the more inclusive grouping or the encouraging of associations with more limited specific purposes.

On the fifth subject, not very much time was spent as to which is the better way to coordinate agencies. Is it better to work out programs so that everybody understands one agency on the program, or is it desirable to have some sort of correlating clearing house or way of working?

Sixth, there was a little attention given to changes in the community unit and the effect it would have on the program.

Seventh, considerable attention was given in one of the groups and some in others as to how you would "channel down" and interchange resources. This group found there was considerable material available in other agencies and was surprised to know how much there was.

The eighth question which was raised was, Where is experimentation needed?

Now which of these can we star or underline and say are the important ones?

There was considerable discussion, and apparently agreement as to the importance of the topics which are herein discussed.

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: We will commence our discussion with a few minutes on fruitful participation. What kind of participation is worthwhile, what is meant by fruitful participation, fruitful methods of participation? There were two or three of the groups yesterday that had some definite suggestions on that.

MISS EMERSON: In the group considering social and recreational life, it was brought out that there is too much talk about segregating in the agricultural groups. It is better to have recreation where all can participate, particularly in the country, and not follow the city model, but to go by the family unit. The need was expressed for three programs of recreation in the country—one where they all participate, one recreation for youth only, and another for adults.

There was discussion as to whether a professional should be employed to run the recreation of the community or whether it would be more fruitful to develop the potential leadership already there.

DR. KIRKPATRICK: In the vocational group, there were several instances mentioned and described of results which had been accomplished through cooperation and coordination which centered around a definite piece of work having a specific base as an objective. One of those dealt with the activities of a canning club of boys' and girls' club in the State of Arkansas which has been running ten years is still going strong. Mr. Rose, I believe, was the man who gave us that description. As we traced that through and checked the points on the board, we found the specific points which

stood out in that connection were somewhat as follows: There was a common task, a task in which the youth and adults were both interested. There was leadership available to originate the thing and carry it through. There was cooperation, there was co-ordination, there was activity running through the whole thing, going back of course to the question of a common program and a common objective. There were other instances which were equally as good. Activities in that particular group went from canning to various other activities.

MR. FELTON: There was a feeling in the religious education group that there was a great lack of religious cooperation. The adults had been operating and left the first two letters in that word to the youth and the feeling was each group had tried to convert the other. Then we asked for definite suggestions by which this cooperation was being worked out. Here are some of them.

No. 1—Church boards nowadays are putting at least one or more young people on their official board to represent the youth.

No. 2—Give young people a chance to discuss and vote in what was known as the annual meeting and the like.

No. 3—Give young people a responsibility in worship. Instances were given of young people conducting the work.

No. 4—Have a study of adolescence by older people, or vice versa, I suppose.

No. 5—Give young people something to do. The common sight of the well-meaning, gray-haired folk taking up the collection on Sunday morning was brought out. Some thought that was a good thing and that it gave dignity to the service, while others thought the young people could be dignified if trained. I think the feeling was general that the young people should be given things like that to do.

No. 6—The next topic was the proper housing of young people's activities. It was brought out that in some places they were held in the church basement, the church basement, when no one else wanted it. The question was discussed whether you should always give the best room in the church to the men in order to get them there.

One man who was there said every Sunday evening his service

was conducted for young people as a forum. I am not sure but it seems to me he has more young people than adults on his church roll.

Dr. Willard: What I am reporting is the judgment of a group which is a continuity of group No. 7 which met the first afternoon and the group which met to discuss the educational agencies and programs yesterday afternoon.

It seems necessary at first to take item No. 3 in your major outline; what is it all about? There, I think, we have come into agreement and this is but a restatement of what has already been accepted.

The main objective of education is continued growth and adaptation. It is impossible to provide for educational needs in the youth sector of age without going back to the pre-school and the school age and laying the foundations which can be laid there only.

The program of education for youth from birth to maturity is now determined by adults. The environment which determines youth's attitudes is controlled by adults. It must ultimately be a co-operative process. To effect progress, the program of education must be gauged to educate adults as well as youth.

The educational program is one which must be carried on by many agencies, not only by the established school system, but by many other agencies which have materials usable by youth and adults.

This group had a very specific recommendation: A conference of national agencies to appraise the total needs for material and to formulate plans for avoiding overlappings in the production of materials and for meeting deficits in the present stocks of materials. This does not mean permanent organization. The mechanism may already be in existence, it may be voluntary grouping that lasts a day or the group which meets at two o'clock this afternoon can do it, but certainly we need a frank look at these materials by all agencies in order to discover how effectively we are meeting this need for materials.

Then the group recommended a further study of youth and its attitudes and needs, such a study to be on wide sampling not of single groups but all groups, inclusive of all groups, and to be made

by disinterested agencies. I was much gratified with the result of the survey of club work; it was most encouraging. There are many youths not in club work. We need a study which will give the attitudes and needs of the entire group of youth.

Talking to the point which is now before us, the group was quite convinced that the crux of the matter both in the ordinary educational process of the established system and religious process, which is not our job, the real trouble was that the attitudes of adults have been formed in the past by circumstances as evolutions of conditions and those evolutions in the country have not progressed as fast as in some other environments. The result is, we are attempting to make youth conform to the ideals of education and to the result of education which we as adults achieve or which we experienced or of which we are the product. We have left youth itself out of the count. We won't make much progress in touching youth until we have made some progress in touching the attitude of adults. We believe ultimately it must be a cooperating program in which youth expresses itself. Youth has scarce been consulted, hence, in all these agencies, whether the established school system or the extension system of education or the health agencies or the recreation agencies, the wishes and the desires and the expressed needs of youth must have a much larger part in guiding for formulation of programs and in the execution of those programs.

Those programs in the future, we believe, will succeed best where youth has cooperative participation not only in the making of the program but in its execution.

I realize this has sprawled over three underlying points but I think it all had to come out together. (Applause.)

Dr. Vermilyea: I suggest youth be invited to this session.

Mr. Hall: They have got to thrash out some things. I think we have devoted our attention too much to convictions on the campuses and not gone back to the farm where youth situations exist.

Miss Allen: One man in the same group Mr. Willard represented, made the suggestion, which didn't receive discussion, that he would like to see how much in earnest we were in this talking about

participation with adults by having a young person acting on the Board of Directors of the Country Life Association.

MR. MAY (Michigan): I am afraid a lot of us are still going back, particularly those of us who live in headquarters and represent organizations from the top, with the idea there are certain definite programs and policies that should be put down on youth. I don't think these college folks that are here are representative of the folks we are talking pretty largely about—the average older boy and girl upon the farm, in the small community. Maybe we have to leave the thing here but I would like to speak a good deal on the other side, whether youth would determine the things they want to do upon the basis of their attitudes and not what we think their needs are. For instance: If one-tenth of what a boy hears becomes a part of him and five-tenths of what he says and seven tenths of what he does, for the Lord's sake let them have a say in what they are going to do. Let Tom and Bill and Sam as they get together, each one of them say what they think regardless of whether they are all wrong or not.

They will finally work the thing out but don't let us tell them what they should do. I would like to see them make out their whole proposition entirely and call upon us when they want help if they have enough respect for us.

DR. VERMILYEA: If this group to which both adults and youth have been invited can't find a way in which we can sit down together, what is the use of talking about it? I think we ought to stop right here until youth and adults are brought together.

PROF. MUMFORD (Illinois): I have listened with a good deal of attention to this discussion and before I go any farther, I want to say I am the father of five daughters. I think it is essential to point out that the public in general believe that the young people are doing altogether too much and they are furnishing altogether too much of the leadership for constructive development. Even in the cartoons you find we have to "bring up father."

Those of you who may know me and know my family and know my reactions will agree that I believe in bringing in youth, but I do know, after thirty years experience with young people, if you furnish the proper leadership, you decide on the proper things to

be done for youth, but if you leave youth without the proper leadership, proper things will not be determined.

MR. KITCHIN: The student group have asked me to say to you the thing that they think they arrived at yesterday, as far as we could arrive anywhere, that we are up against a problem about which we need information. We are going back to get that in all the ways we can. One thing we were sure of was that we needed some more facts about the situation. We said we want to go back to the farm to get those facts, where we can see it and feel it and live with it.

We also want a greater opportunity to catch that from those who are our instructors. We want more opportunity (this may seem contradictory) to rub shoulders with those of you who have the information and the vision and the fire for country life. Some of our education students said we want to psychologize the curriculum. We want this information put in terms of living situations, in order that we can understand it a bit better. We find our information disconnected from the life situation sometimes.

We want to get the leaders on our campus interested in this problem in order that they can help us. The student group continuation committee is wondering how we can get the most out of these meetings. We recognize fully some of the students who come here are not prepared to face the problems which this group is facing. I think the continuation committee will interest itself in making that situation different another year by bringing more mature students, if that is possible, and we also would like this group to think as simply as possible in order that they can follow the trend of thought here.

PROFESSOR DUNN: I have been thinking perhaps our difficulty is in calling a thing a community that isn't a community. We are thinking a good deal of this community interest of the adult and of the youth. It has been brought out that the bond is determined by the adults. I am inclined to think the center of community consideration and community activity is pretty largely determined by the adults. A friend of mine sometimes says that cooperation very often resolves itself into operation by the one group and "co'ing" by the other group.

When adults get together to talk about community activities of youth, they are thinking about what the youth can contribute to the adult's community interests and activities. It seems to me before we get anywhere in this program we must stop being selfish, stop thinking about what we want for our benefits, what we want for the convenience of the community and give the youth absolutely equal things. We are saying the youth is part of the community but we are dominating the whole thing and it creeps into our discussion every now and then. We talk about using the youth. We don't mean it but we have so long thought of the social community as the people over fifteen or twenty years of age, it becomes an attitude. We need to change it. It isn't just going back and making the farm people change their attitudes. It is changing social leaders' attitudes in order to give the youth their share in a community.

Miss Roelofs: What we need will not be accomplished by an indiscriminate throwing together of these two groups; each group has to be carefully prepared to understand what the matter under consideration should be. You have to have a development of leadership of each group. Then selection of representatives and cooperation through the working together of the representatives of the two groups rather than throwing the whole lot all together. Then there came this talk of not being quite on the same ground. You find that in any two sex groups or age groups, it is the same thing.

You have to develop in your group first a class consciousness or group consciousness and take your leaders of the two and then go back and gradually there will be respect and understanding so that the desired result is effected. I don't feel discouraged when you say, as has been said here this morning, that two groups can't get together. It can be done.

Mr. Malcolm Dana, Jr. (Hartford Theological Seminary): It seems to me youth and adults are not two separate groups. We are traveling along the same route, traveling together. We have the enthusiasm and energy that is uppermost and you have the experience. You are going to drop off sooner; we are coming along to take your places. One of the ideal things you can do is to give us definite responsibilities so that as we come along we are going to be forced to go to you people as sources of information and help

to carry on the task. That way youth and adult are going to travel along the same route, hand in hand, and not going to be misunderstood.

MR. KITCHIN: One thing I think ought to be said that I know is in the hearts of the students: They want much closer relationship with this older group than the machinery to date has allowed us to get.

MR. PARKER (The World Agriculture): Wouldn't it be well for these young people to go back and turn their attention, each one in his or her community, to the agencies and homes that are working out this fruitful cooperation, and then bring in their reports? For example, isn't the grange doing this very thing—giving youth responsibility? Isn't the 4-H Club an example of valued leadership and giving a chance to the young people to find their way?

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: May we go to the second question as to whether we are together in our objectives? We may not need to spend any time on this at all. We may find Mr. Willard is right as to what we are after and our being agreed. There seemed to come into discussions yesterday some differences of emphasis. Do you want to say anything at all upon this question, as to what it is we are after on the total movement in the country; are there any suggestions from any of the groups on that as well as from the individuals of the conference?

DR. MUMFORD: I want to say one thing more in connection with this subject. I am not quite sure I got it across because I feel so strongly on this matter. In the first place, I must courteously take issue with the statement that our programs for youth are built for the fathers and mothers. I can't subscribe to that. As a father, and knowing mothers and fathers, I would say that most of our community programs are built with the idea of satisfying the young people. If there is anything that the father and mother live for, it is for their children. It seems to me that the problem of this youth matter is pretty much the problem of the parents. Are we simply going to say all the experience we have as older people is simply going to be set aside? That is the real fundamental problem. It is all right to do that provided there is wise guidance. It is a good executive that brings into conference many people and lets

them think that they are deciding what the program is. After all, the leader decides it.

MR. WILLARD: The aim or objective of education of rural life is continued growth and adaptation.

DR. MUMFORD: By active participation. That is the real factor in the process. We learn to do by doing. It is on the basis of participation in group activities that you have a real process. The difficulty has been in the process of combination, perhaps, and that domination may be on the part of the youth or may be on the part of the adults; up until recently, the adults. What we need most now, it seems to me, is a real sharing process and there seems to be the real crux of the situation that we can't find the technique of the actual sharing rather than growth. There it may not turn out to be growth. It may be growth of greater chaos.

MR. HACKER (Illinois): I don't understand what we mean by growth.

In my own mind, I have seven points: Health, the home, family life, vocations, fundamental processes, citizenship, leisure and religion. We will grow on all seven.

We know a great deal depends upon our home. We also have a vocation to render some worthwhile service to humanity. Reading and writing and arithmetic are the fundamental processes. Under citizenship, we have the use of the ballot and all those other things. A great deal of leisure is being spent in the automobile and in the picture shows and it may pull us down or lift us up. Then I think religion is almost one of the great factors that we cannot get along without.

MR. HALL: I would like to see a big line drawn under home. The children who are leaving the home are the children of no responsibility at home. Parents don't know where they are. The children are allowed to boss the parents rather than the parents the children. There is a happy medium to be struck there. The parents had a whole lot rather expend energy in using the whip than sad reflection over what they have built up.

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: I am perfectly willing to move on to the next subject. I am puzzled by what you mean by adaptation and

growth. The questions which puzzle me in education are still unanswered.

MR. GILBERT (Drew Theological Seminary): You can develop the mind of this youth through his thinking the problem through and both the youth and adult are going to develop along the two lines of leadership training and participation. Can we go on to ways in which we can train leadership to help youth and how we are going to get youth to participate in this problem of thinking the thing through?

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: I would like to call on Mr. Willard to sum this up for us or we will all go home with a different idea of what growth is and what adaptation is.

MR. WILLARD: The thought behind adaptation is that mankind is engaged in the processes of molding his environment to his advantage or making the best adjustment he can to it if he can't change it. That involves understanding.

On the matter of growth, a person grows by what he does himself. The process of education of the future should be the furnishing of the materials to the individual including the guidance Dr. Mumford stresses, but letting the educational process be primarily the resultant of what the educated individual himself does, what he accomplishes, what he achieves, and I think what was behind the thought of the committee was that this growth should not stop when youth ceases to be youth, when youth becomes the next generation of adults, but that this open, effective, capable mind should be so developed that no matter wherein the process of life problems come up, no matter whether the process of adaptation is necessary at twenty or forty or sixty or eighty, this mind is still capable of making contingent adaptations to these conditions. That is what was implied in growth.

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: Perhaps if we could hear from the social and recreational group, it might help us to get at the sort of things those people found themselves facing yesterday.

MR. FOSTER: One of the best ways of presenting it is this: The U. S. Children's Bureau furnishes manuals of various sorts, free field service of various sorts, free lecture institutes for agency groups of different types, and yet we have fifteen different agencies

working in the field professionally. Not one knew of the services of this one particular organization which is a free service except the one representative from that actual group.

We recommend that a permanent committee be set up by the American Country Life Association to eliminate the city material from the recreational and social program and bring together material adaptable and usable in farm communities and for farm enterprises and basing that material upon the interests and the life situations of the folks living in the country; that the various farm journals and farm papers bring together material of this sort in recreational and social pages so we can have a dissemination of that type of information; that use of the American Playground Association, now being used very little by the agencies represented, through their information service, through their field service, training and so forth, be encouraged; that the use of the Drama League, of the American Story-tellers League, and those various agencies not being used be encouraged in extending a bigger recreational program.

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: Mr. Willard, do you wish to say a word on similar lines?

MR. WILLARD: I don't think there is much more to say except those who have made application in the field of materials have been quite chagrined to find what they have produced is inferior to something already available, and we would have been very glad to adopt the other material to save ourselves the labor. The thought was that certain national agencies are producing materials all the time. It would be worthwhile to get a total appraisal of what all these agencies have, to discover where they overlap, and what needs are not yet met.

MR. TURNER: In the group discussing health with various agencies represented, various individuals expressed their opinions that this material did exist but the lack of clearing house was the reason why folks did not know of material available on health as far as the farm boys and girls are concerned. The question came up whether a national agency should be that clearing house or whether that should be more local.

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: What have you to say on this question

of the types of material needed and the duplications and how we can find out what there is?

Dr. Dunn: As to the last point, I very much think there is need of a clearing house nationally. The development of such a clearing house has been hindered by a misinterpretation of the materials of education. I find very constantly an attitude on the part of people in general to think that education and school education are synonymous terms. For that reason, agencies like health, agencies like club activities, agencies like library activities, and so forth, feel the necessity of setting up specific leads, specific organizations of their own to perform pieces of the educational program. We have in the United States a Federal Bureau of Education. I am not a member of that bureau and that may not be the place to head this up, but I maintain that the Bureau of Education should be by interpretation a broad enough agency to include just the clearing house activities which you have indicated here. If we interpret education to mean schools alone, we can never really educate.

We had a meeting yesterday afternoon of educational agencies and I think there were about twenty of those represented. As long as we continue to think of education, to define education, the purpose of education as continued growth, and then, as long as we try to get that continued growth chopped up, growth in health, growth in practical efficiency, growth in this, that and the other thing, I don't see how we are ever going to contribute to each other's realization of that which is our own purpose. It seems to me our jealousies, the jealousy of one agency for another, the jealousy of many agencies for the school as presumably the institution which is usurping it itself all the educational functions, are the reason we don't know more about what each one of us is doing and the reason why we are duplicating each other's efforts constantly.

Mr. Hacker: I wonder if we don't need case studies. What are the successful churches doing? What are the successful community schools doing? What are the successful county nurses doing? We could have them compiled in each state. I wonder if we couldn't all read them and profit thereby.

Dr. Kirkpatrick: Mr. Chairman, the two remarks I want to make bear on both points 7 and 5. There is first the channeling

down of information and the need for adaptation of this information for specific purposes. The other day in group 3 it was pointed out that there is a dearth of ideas among farm women as to various steps of improvement in the home and thereabouts. Very few knew of the work being done by the Better Homes organization of the United States.

That organization has made one of its activities the business of adapting the things which are available to uses in the various communities and they have accomplished remarkable results. Bearing on that point, I think I can bring that out more clearly and also connect that with point 5. You see a number of charts around the wall prepared for this particular meeting. About seventy people have participated in this task. There was first a running down of material; second, the adaptation of this material for this specific purpose. If you look at chart 4, if we had put that chart on the wall in the condition in which we found it in the journal, good as it was, serving a specific purpose in technical journals, none of you would have understood it. We may have had jealousies in the group which prepared it. Not one individual who was asked to make contribution for the specific purposes of the common program neglected to do the thing which was required when they understood the purpose.

So it seems to me that the motive behind it, the purpose in channeling down the material, and the adaptation for its specific uses, is the determining factor. There is always the question when we get down to farm youth and other youth for the purpose of helping them to use the material. I have found in working with various groups when the material is placed before them—one act plays or whatever it may be—it finally gets down to some one's giving a little suggestion as to the advantages of this compared with that and so on to enable them finally to reach a decision before the idea of doing the thing wears off.

Dr. E. R. Hunt (Department of Commerce): Purely by way of suggestion, I want to mention a method developed in the Department of Commerce. It is an old method for getting facts before the group whose action will be socially important. A study is made which almost always develops a type of best practice in industry. It

pulls out of an immense mass of material an example of some factory, some employer, some trade association which is conducting its business in the way in which is superior to ordinary practice.

That fact, which is almost always known to experts, is presented to the employer group not by the expert who is unknown to them, but by a sponsoring committee of their own industrial movement. The result is, the whole movement develops industrial leaders.

I am wondering if there isn't a suggestion in that method for this field in which the Association is working, that is, if it is a question of studying cases—not simply studying cases from the point of view of the expert, but studying cases from the point of view of the groups which will have to use that experience and if it might not be possible to develop a type of sponsoring representative organization which would take this material and say, "This is what we find. The best practice in this field we find here. Here is a model. Here is another model. We underwrite these models." I suspect any such program as that would bring together these so-called jealous groups, conflicting groups on what might very well develop into a common national program.

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: You would suggest a unification of case studies?

DR. HUNT: It is not in a sense a coordinating organization. We lose a great deal of time sometimes in feeling because two or three agencies are in the field there is a great deal of duplication. In this work, the more the merrier. There can't be too many working on some of these problems. Mere mechanical unification is deadening.

DR. DUNN: What is your machinery?

DR. HUNT: Again I am speaking from the set-up in the Department of Commerce. Let me say the Department of Commerce in that respect is a mere forum. These groups then are assembled. The initiative lies primarily in the groups.

DR. DUNN: That is just the problem. It is just the difficulty we are up against. Who is going to assemble the groups into the forum? How is the forum to be organized? What is the machinery

of getting all these diverse groups contributing to the common program?

Dr. Mumford: I want to agree with Dr. Dunn when she says there are too many jealousies among the different organizations and agencies. I think from what I have said that you will agree that I am jealous of one agency and that is the home. I think that we make a very great mistake in this work if we do not make every possible use of the resources of the home. I fully appreciate the fact that all homes are not resources. I think that it is clear to all the workers here that one of our difficulties is that we have to overcome the prejudice and inertia of some homes, and yet, on the other hand, I believe that our work ought to reach back into that home and that we have too much of the idea—even the churches—that we are going to substitute for the home and not supplement the home. I object to that.

I am going to give you one example to bring out clearly what I have in mind. When my children were a little younger, a certain good woman of the church, a young woman by the way, was the leader of what they call the Junior League. She used to discuss everything. She one evening propounded this question to those young people and questioned them one by one right around the room: If you should get into serious trouble and needed somebody to advise with, to tell you what to do, to whom would you go? Every one of them said, "We'd go to you." She reached my son and he said, "I'd go to my father." I never had greater confidence placed in me than that.

Dr. Elliot reviewed what had been gone over thus far.

Dr. True: I would suggest that the American Country Life Association take this matter of sources of information at hand, and through the central office tell what are the sources of such information and correlate what are the sources. Then put that in form, print it and distribute that to the various agencies we are concerned with. I think that would be quite helpful. The question of the establishment of a central agency to give this information out, that is a complicated matter and would mean more consideration than could be given here.

I think at this meeting we could set in motion some preparatory

work that needs to be done in order to inform various agencies as to the sources of the information.

MR. GUFFEY: I feel that we are touching on the core of the whole thing here. I have five children. My greatest problem is to try to keep out of the home those that are trying to educate them away from the home. You realize that nine-tenths or ninety-nine per cent of the suggestions as to what to do along lines of education are based upon amalgamation of six or seven different psychological schools all of whom contend against the other, who say they are false. It is a mixed up mess.

The average boy on the farm, or the average girl, if they are just left alone will work out his or her own salvation anyhow.

The Bureau of Education of our Government, it seems to me, can do just this sort of thing. We have enough agencies existing to solve every problem without creating any more. There is the agency that ought to be able to do for the whole province of education, eliminating the waste and complexity just as the Department of Commerce is doing for the industrial world. There is no question of what they are doing.

MISS MERRILL: In the State of Ohio, the correlation of State agencies has actually been secured. In Ohio, through a state council of social agencies which includes the state-supported activities and private ones, a common understanding of purpose and program was secured and that common work was actually done in counties in certain parts of the State.

MR. DENUNE: I want to second what Dr. True has said. The American Life Association is in a unique position. I have always conceived the American Country Life Association in some sort of position as that. It should know the sources of information. It is in position to assemble the sources of material from these agencies and then diseminate them to the agencies working in the field.

MR. FOSTER: It was the report of the Committee on Social and Recreational Activities that suggested that the American Country Life Association act as a clearing house by forming committees representing the various groups to bring together and coordinate this material. I want to support Dr. True's position. The American Country Life Association is only worthwhile in so far as the various

agencies working in the counties support it. If it is worthwhile and all the agencies give their support to it as a clearing house, it seems we have found the right method.

DR. ADAMS: I think we mustn't forget in resource material, personnel resource. In the organization I am connected with, we constantly want to know who is the demonstration agent in the country, who are the local health agencies, and so on. That is extraordinarily hard to get. Local people want to know just what are all the available resources in expert persons and organizations. So I should strongly emphasize personnel resources.

DR. TRUE: I want to know why it is difficult to find out who the county agent is in any county.

DR. ADAMS: It is especially difficult for national organizations with headquarters here, there and everywhere if they are writing to their local people. They can of course say, "You can find out," but particularly in the voluntary organizations, people don't know those things, don't know them as much as you would think that they might.

MR. FELTON: It seems to me if we had a county council of social agencies, these various representatives would know what they had and in that way get the material down to the people who need it. The county home demonstration agent would know what was available on this subject of home-making. In one county, as I recall now, Allegheny County, New York, they have monthly meetings of the county council of social agencies. These various representatives know what their organizations have and make them available to the others.

The question was also raised of getting their offices together. We heard the rather interesting illustration yesterday of a county Y. M. C. A. secretary and county Y. W. C. A. secretary having their offices in the same building and on the same floor adjoining. We were told that was a good means of letting each other know what the other was doing. It seems to me this helps removing the suspicion that Dr. Dunn mentioned that our county should be our unit. I am not sure that any overhead clearing house or agency would do for these country workers what they can do for themselves.

MR. WILLARD: Speaking as an individual and not voicing the

opinion of the group, I believe we should proceed slowly in establishing any more kinds of mechanism or crystalizing anything in organizations which may have difficulty in getting financed when it serves its usefulness. I would like to support Dr. True's suggestion and inquire of the officers of the American Country Life Association whether in their judgment it would be possible to undertake this initial contribution of the statement of resources now available.

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: Would that include Dr. Hunt's suggestion about case studies or simply printed resources?

MR. WILLARD: It could be gotten by writing. I would like to ask President Butterfield, if he is in the room, whether anything has been prepared to indicate what the cost would be.

PRESIDENT BUTTERFIELD: Not along all lines.

MR. WILLARD: I meant this matter of collecting information about resources.

MR. ISRAEL: With what we are undertaking now, we have all we can carry.

DR. DWIGHT SANDERSON (Cornell University): It seems to me this is a very important but complex proposition that we are spending quite a little time on. It seems to me it would seem wise to refer this to the smaller body of officers and directors.

PRESIDENT BUTTERFIELD: If the thing doesn't involve any large expense, we have a certain amount of machinery and it is quite possible it can be done.

MR. SHINN: In practically all of the Government Departments—the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of Education, Public Health, and so forth—there are units for the purpose of getting out and assembling within the department materials that can be used by teachers and other rural workers in the various organizations.

It seems to me if greater publicity could be given to these sources of information, that is, what is available in the Department of Agriculture, what is available in the Department of Commerce, what is available in the Bureau of Education or the Board of Health, and many of our farm papers and other educational papers give greater publicity to the sources of this material, we would simplify this thing a great deal.

DR. DUNN: The Journal of Rural Education is dead because we couldn't get enough support to publish it.

DR. TRUE: It is not my intention at the present time to give the Country Life Association a large task. What I had in mind was that this Association should get together the different sources of information, that different agencies that are publishing things in which the Country Life Association is interested. If such a thing could be prepared and contributed to the different agencies represented in this Association, I believe it would be very helpful.

PROF. WILLARD: May I offer a motion that this question be referred to the officers of the American Country Life Association and the council of agencies engaged in rural social work for such action as in their judgment seems wise. As this is not a legislative meeting, possibly it had better be in the form of a suggestion which could be referred to President Butterfield.

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: It was more a question, if there was any united conviction here as to what needed to be done. It will have to be referred to the Ways and Means Committee to figure out how it can be done. I was hoping we could get more light as to the exact thing that you want.

MR. TUTTLE (The Book of Rural Life): I would like to say something that is in my heart. There is an old Arabian proverb that says:

"Men are four: He who knows and knows he knows, he is wise; follow him. He who knows and knows not he knows, he is asleep; wake him. He who knows not and knows not he knows not, he is a fool; shun him. He who knows not and knows he knows not, he is a child; teach him."

I can't help feeling that in this room the salvation of rural life in America rests, but it can't come unless an individual as a human soul consecrates himself and herself to that task personally. I want to ask every one of us, when we go out of here and sort down out of the confusion of ideas that has come and the principles we may have reached together or individually, to go off under the stars or out alone somewhere, or down on his knees and consecrate himself and herself to that task.

"Thou must be true thyself
If thou the truth wouldst teach;
Thy soul must overflow
If thou another soul wouldst reach.

It needs the overflow of heart
To give the lips full speech.
Think truly, and thy church
Shall the world's famine feed.

Speak truly, and each word of thine
Shall be a fruitful seed;
Live truly, and thy life shall be
A great and noble creed."

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: What do you wish to say, if anything, on question 5 which had to do with the methods of local coordination?

DR. VERMILYEA: It seems that is one of the very vital fields. We have a great deal of material that is on the shelves now. I don't think you can get anywhere unless you can get the local groups together, discovering the interest of the committees.

There ought to be worked out some kind of coordinated body that would think of the common task of those communities and approach them some way together. I would like to see some attention given to that. If we are to carry to the field anything that will cooperate with the field, there must be some channel through which we can do it. We can depend upon it, it will be a long, long time before these communities get the data, the unified message, they ought to get and develop the spirit of community we feel they ought to have.

MR. WRIGHT (Virginia): In Virginia we have our County Council of Rural Agencies. I am fortunate to be working in a county in which the County Council operates and I believe there is a very definite possibility of this organization reaching the local people.

DR. VERMILYEA: Who constitute that local council?

MR. WRIGHT: Every whole-time county worker; the rural churches if they are in the county organization have two representatives.

DR. VERMILYEA: It seems to me the church groups are proceeding on the assumption nobody else cares about things quite as they care about them. Other groups are proceeding on the assumption

that they haven't the leadership. It doesn't matter how we relate ourselves, there is a good deal of antagonism and feeling that the other group is to be discredited. After all, we cannot go forward unless we go forward together. We are each making our contribution and the sum total will ultimately determine what the result is.

I fear that among our church groups and other social agencies there is not enough effort made to see to it even though there may be no local agency, that representatives of that particular section there are found in that common council.

MR. PARKER: We are trying very hard to get this correlation. We have in our committee all the principal denominations represented, agriculture colleges, 4-H work and so forth, and then through religious education committees we have the Boy and Girl Scouts, Campfire Girls, Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A. represented.

PROF. NOLAN (University of Illinois): There are a good many communities in the State of Illinois that have a council in which the churches, the lodges, the women's clubs, the teachers and every other agency are coordinated.

MR. ROSENLOF: I don't believe we can stop. I believe we have to go farther. We have to come straight down to Washington, D. C., and bring about a coordination of the Department of Agriculture and Bureau of Education, thereby making it possible for a federal agency, I don't care what agency it might be, to say through its State representatives and its local representatives, "We encourage you and we enjoin upon you as our local representatives the business of finding out every agency in your community, every activity in your community, and working with and through all of those organizations in a coordinated program." Unless you have a Federal coordination you can't do very much. Your hands are tied.

MR. TURNER: It came out sharply in the group discussing health that it was much more probable that there would be a coordinating of common programs rather than a coordinating of organizations and that the county be the geographical unit for bringing about that coordination of programs.

DR. HUNT: I am thinking not in terms of national activity but local activity. This question of agencies overlapping and the work

they actually do in the locality has been stimulated. During the War we were always listening to this talk about coordination, liaison and that sort of thing. Everybody who came out of that school was sick for life of the mere mechanical union of agencies.

When we come down to our own town, our own countryside, it is hard to say we can dispense with this or that, or cut down the number of denominations and get just as much work done with one-half the number of agencies as we have now. I don't want to crawfish too much but that was my approach. I wasn't thinking in terms of national overlapping but actual activity and stimulation in any one community.

Miss Roelofs: Dr. Willard stated this morning a definition of function which it seems to me bears directly on this point. May I ask he be requested to state that?

Dr. Willard: This thought concerned national rather than local agencies. A conference of national agencies should appraise the total needs of material, the present stock of materials and resources, deficits in present stocks, duplication of materials, overlapping of materials, to formulate plans for avoiding overlapping and meeting deficits in educational material. That, I think, is cleared up in our discussion on the national agency.

Dr. Brunner: I would like to draw attention to the fact that the Institute of Social and Religious Research attempted a study of cooperation of agencies with poor results. Two or three of them said they weren't interested in cooperation because they had their own machinery. It is all right to throw it over to the National Council of Agencies but in some way you must have a conversion if they are going to carry it very far.

Prof. Felton: It seems to me if we are thinking about the local community what we need is to reduce the number of agencies. This council for overhead agencies is very good and I imagine even in those meetings, the more the merrier. I am very sure with overhead officials, the more the merrier is a very worthwhile policy to pursue. When we get into the local community somebody has to pay the bills unfortunately. Someone said last night we were forgetting our rural communities; they were running on four flat tires. I don't know whether those connected with the bureaus or

whatever you term them realize what some of the people in the local communities are up against in supporting all these agencies. I would like to give some illustrations but will not take the time now. They can't stand it any longer.

I don't want to talk about it. Nearly everybody has talked about how many children they have. I would like to discuss that for a minute but I won't. One of my children has seventeen agencies appeal to her for her time. I think we should reduce the number.

Miss Heyl (Teachers College, Columbia): The question was asked a little while ago what part rural youth was having in this. I come from a state where we have a program which might be described by Miss Frieda Koontz.

Miss Frieda Koontz (Cooperation Education Assn): In Virginia we do have a clearing house organization in the public schools in both rural communities and the city. Of course, Virginia is a rural state and it is making an effort to give these boys and girls in their school life an opportunity for setting a precedent to discover leadership and to develop it under the wise guidance of the principal factors. The principal of the school and other members of the faculty are delegated as sponsors of the various phases of the work. It helps the boys and girls to see that citizenship means living each day up to a certain standard. The program is of such a nature it gets the boys and girls back of everything in Virginia that is working with boys and girls, the heads of all organizations working with every type of boy and girl organization. Through this correlation is brought about a vitalization of the splendid work being done in Virginia. It is striving to bring closer contact between the older folks and youth throughout the community.

Mr. Lindeman: The reason we don't make any advance on the problem of coordination is because we keep on assuming what is a fallacy, that there is such a thing as verbal coordination, the old fallacy of sitting around the table and thinking because you sit around the table and talk, thereafter your action will conform to your talk. As a matter of fact, the opposite is more likely to be true. We talk about too many agencies; who is going to be the executioner? The agencies must eliminate themselves if there are too many, and one, two or three little experiments on the level of

functional coordination will carry us much farther than years and years of talk.

If I were to answer the question of what rural youth's place would be in rural communities, I should say their place will be found when rural youth become sufficiently militant, sufficiently overcome their present timidity to talk for themselves, to open up in rural communities the essence of the conflict which exists between them.

I should like to see this conference give the movement of the rural militant youth something of a push. I don't think they are going to get anywhere until they get a little more revolutionary themselves, revolutionary on the level of action, not on the level of talk.

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: Is there any possibility of this group encouraging experiments along the line that Mr. Lindeman suggested? I don't know whether there is a possibility of answering the challenge of one or two people of accurate information as to what is happening. Perhaps if we say that the record of this last discussion should be examined by the Board of Directors and the Council of Agencies and the others following up this conference and if it is found we are not making progress from year to year, we probably could investigate to find if there were more definite ways of dealing with the problem.

MISS AMALIA BENGSTON (Teachers College, Columbia University): I am wondering if this group were to accept the suggestions as outlined by Dr. Willard, would it be possible then to adopt those as resolutions of this particular section.

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: I understand we have practically accepted the recommendations of Dr. Willard.

I would be glad now to turn the meeting over to the President of the American Country Life Association.

Dr. Brunner took the Chair.

CHAIRMAN BRUNNER: Is there any action the meeting wishes to take on the discussion of this morning or do we simply assume that Mr. Elliott has taken care of this recommendation?

MR. ROSENLOF: I move that we accept the report given by Dr. Willard as clarifying the action and placing it before our body.

The motion was seconded and carried.

DR. VERMILYEA: I would like to move it is the sense of this organization that every representative here go out to the field and seek to develop a sense of community interest and cooperation, and make possible a unified program.

The motion was seconded and carried.

DR. WILLARD: I feel one thing more ought to be said about the conference as a whole. Dr. Elliott has been inclined to feel former conferences were unproductive and wondered if the same would be true here. I feel the conference in Columbus on the country church has been tremendously productive. It has accomplished a greater sympathy in the local units of the church in country towns with competing churches.

If I understand the purposes of this Association rightly, it is not to be a functional, operating agency but a conference agency. So may I say, speaking for myself, that these conferences are worthwhile and do produce results.

DR. MUMFORD: We are having a conference of leaders, of various leaders from all over the country, and that conference has had a leader for three years who has skilfully, fairly, and with unfailing courtesy conducted the meetings. I think we all want to express our appreciation to Dr. Elliott.

The members arose and applauded.

REPORT OF STUDENT SECTION

ANNA MANSFIELD CLARK
National Board of the Y. W. C. A.

THE ninth annual conference of the American Country Life Association was noteworthy for the number of students attending and the quality of their participation. Student participation is no new thing in the conferences that have preceeded this, since for many years the Collegiate Country Life Clubs have been at the conferences and have held their annual meetings at the same time. At Columbus in 1924 a new student movement appeared, bursting into the conference from the outside, holding student meetings and making a distinct student contribution to the discussions. Again at Richmond a smaller group met at the same time, but because most of the students came only at the week-end they missed most of the conference program.

The meeting at Washington had this difference, that the committee which promoted the conference was composed of members of the American Country Life Association and students themselves, who worked as regional committees meeting in Chicago, Washington and New York. The result was an attendance of more than forty students representing Collegiate Country Life Clubs, Four-H Clubs, Student Granges, Y. M. C. A., Y. W. C. A., Theological Seminaries, Hampton Institute, Howard University and many other groups and schools.

At the beginning session the students voted to be an integral part of the conference and only hold separate sessions when the conference divided into organization groups. At their session they emphasized as the problems of youth, farmer attitudes, individualism in rural thinking as opposed to cooperative action, lack of social life and recreation. "We want something beside horseback riding," one student remarked. The right type of leaders was discussed at

length, and the students spoke quite emphatically out of their own experience of "teachers that were always moving on," of leaders "no one wanted to be like," of their lack of perspective on farm life and above all of the lach of the quality of life which these young men and women felt was the hungry need of their home communities. There was little interest in special skills or how students might acquire these. A yearning for something which was one defined as religion but as ideals, spiritual values, philosophy, seemed to be the quality of leadership which country life lacked and which this group desired to give.

This conference did not differ widely from other student conferences, for undergraduates have a recurring tendency to think in terms of campus problems. They vividly outlined some of the problems that they as country boys and girls had to meet because they came from the country and the way in which these problems had been solved. The solution of campus problems was discussed at length, particularly needed changers in educational method.

The result of the short discussions were the following findings presented to the last session:

Feeling that we have a definite contribution to make to the program of the American Country Life Association, The Student Group wishes to recommend that:

1. The attention of already proved youth leaders on our campuses be directed toward the solution of farm youth problems.

2. The youth leaders put forth more effort toward getting actual contacts with rural experiences, through definite projects fostered by 4-H Groups, Boy Scouts, Y. M. C. A., Y. W. C. A., etc.

3. The curricula on our campuses be "psychologized"; that it be translated into real life situations for the student.

4. As far as possible, we use the machinery already available, in the solution of farm youth problems—i.e., American Country Life Conferences, etc.

5. We keep ourselves informed in regard to all rural problems.

Perhaps the most significant outcome of the student meeting was the ardent desire to "carry on" and help to gather at East Lansing in 1927 students from all groups interested in country life. A student chairman appointed a committee, which worked at odd

moments and far into the night after the evening sessions upon this matter. This committee worked out a statesmanlike plan for promoting attendance and set up sufficient machinery well oiled and adequate for drawing to the conference mature students who will be asked to make preparation. "We will have to face the economic question some day and we might as well begin to study it now," said one of the girls. This committee is no new campus organization, no new national organization, but a means of uniting at the conference all those students to whom country life may be a field of adventure and a future field of vocation. Through the future conferences they hope to spread an idea. They have taken a long look ahead, for youth itself is to carry the idea, is to stretch out for more knowledge because of a growing and intelligent interest in vital life situations. They are eager to know the leaders who have carried the vision of a finer and more satisfying country life forward and because they wish responsibility they have asked for representation on the policy-making body of the American Country Life Association—the board of directors.

DATA AVAILABLE AT THE CONFERENCE

The Washington Conference was the occasion for gathering existing data about the situation faced by farm youth and also for making new studies. This article presents a list of sources which may be secured.

The Status of Farm Youth—A mimeographed paper of 25 pages prepared by the Washington group of the American Country Life Association for use at the Ninth National Country Life Conference. Available at 25c. a copy from the American Country Life Association, 1849 Grand Central Terminal, New York City.

Farm Youth—A Selected List of References to Literature Issued Since January, 1920. Compiled by Margaret T. Olcott and Louise O. Bercaw. Agricultural Economics Bibliography No. 17, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

Rural School Circulars—Three in mimeographed form, furnished by the Bureau of Education, Department of Interior, Washington, D. C. Titles and authors as follows:

No. 18. *Educational Achievement of One-Teacher and Larger Rural Schools*—By Timon Covert.

No. 19. *Education and Farm Youth*—A summary of recent developments in the field of rural education. Prepared in the Division of Rural Education.

No. 20. *United States Rural Population for Age Groups 10-20 Years, 1920*—By Edith A. Lathrop and William McKinley Robinson.

The Federal Bureau for Vocational Education (Washington) compiled a mimeographed circular entitled "Miscellaneous Studies of Rural Youth Problems."

The Bureau of the Census made available a special release dated November 11, 1926, on farm population, with divisions into age groups, and announced a forthcoming monograph upon farm population.

PART III

REPORTS OF THE AMERICAN COUNTRY LIFE ASSOCIATION

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE AMERICAN COUNTRY LIFE ASSOCIATION

A Cooperative Agency for Rural Social Enterprise—Under this heading we might well generalize as to the activities of the American Country Life Association during the past year as follows: The Association has functioned as a clearing house on rural affairs in a larger way than it ever has before. It recognizes as never before that the city as well as the country is concerned with the unbalanced situation in which rural life is at a disadvantage. A beginning has been made to find, in New York City, leaders in the business world who have contacts with country life, or who have made their start on a farm, and who have never lost that early love for the countryside, to take counsel, and to help solve this national problem. It became, during the year, part of a world cooperative enterprise. We can hardly estimate what the revealing visit to Africa of our representative, Miss Mabel Carney, means to us as well as to that vast continent. We participated in an international country life conference in Europe this summer through our president and a splendid delegation of our American men and women who fellowshiped with those of other nations for a great common purpose. Even while this report is being written a letter comes from Korea, commenting on the visit of one of our illustrious members, President Franklin S. Harris of Brigham Young University, who carried with him a commission of this Association to the nations of the world which he is visiting. Its relationship to such great social forces as the National Conference of Social Work and its membership in the National Social Work Council is proving invaluable. It has the growing confidence and support of five thousand members and friends who gave us, since last we met, upwards of $48,000 to

carry on as deliberate a rural social engineering project as exists in the world today.

The Farm Woman's Movement—One of the outstanding events of the year was the conference of Farm Women held in Chicago, March 8 to 11, when sixteen farm women, representatives of the United States, from California to Vermont, and from Canada to Louisiana, came together to discuss the question, "What Do Farm Women Want?" This conference was reported in *Rural America* for June.

The International Conference—This was an event of historic import which took place at Brussels in July. About a dozen countries were represented by thirty or more delegates while twice that number of people were in attendance at some of the sessions. As Dr. Butterfield reported in the September issue of *Rural America*, "It will take a little time, possibly several years, to perfect the organization of the International Country Life Commission. Language difficulties, differences of aim and method all enter into the problem."

The *Hand Book of Rural Social Resources* is meeting a popular demand. The first paper covered edition is being sold rapidly. The publication of this book was a demonstration of cooperative enterprise, which we believe is responsible for its generous reception.

The Rural Student Movement—In accordance with the repeated requests of students at our annual conferences at St. Louis, Columbus, and again at Richmond, a standing student committee has been appointed. It has functioned largely in connection with the preparation for the Farm Youth Conference and has held three regional meetings, one in Chicago, one in New York, and one in Washington.

The National Council of Agencies Engaged in Rural Social Work—The *Hand Book of Rural Social Resources* gives evidence of what the member agencies of this Council are doing in the rural field. Coordination of agency efforts is reflected in this year's conference by a variety of contributions.

Immediately Ahead of Us—We are already looking forward to the tenth anniversary conference of our Association which will be held early in August, 1927, at the Michigan State College of

Agriculture, at East Lansing, which enjoys with us the leadership of President Butterfield and whose invitation to come to East Lansing we have accepted. At that same time, this institution will be celebrating its seventieth anniversary. As was indicated in a previous paragraph, the International Country Life Conference will meet either immediately before or immediately after our conference. The Catholic Rural Life Conference, at its recent meeting at Cincinnati, decided to hold its next meeting in conjunction with our conference. The Joint Committee of the American Farm Economic Association and our own Association have been working on the subject of the inter-relations of industrial and social aspects in agriculture, and it is suggested that the conference devote itself to this problem under some such topic as "Farm Income and Farm Life."

Upon invitation of the National Conference of Social Work, the Committee on Rural Social Work, of which Mr. Leroy Ramsdell is the chairman, has taken up the suggestion that we conduct in Des Moines, in May, a two-session discussion meeting limited to fifty selected leaders in social work, education, the ministry, farmers' organizations, farm women's organizations and farm press editors—admission to be by invitation only. The subject suggested is "What has social work to give to the rural communities of America?" An accumulating evidence is compelling us to consider almost immediately a thorough-going sifting of the facts and an intelligent discussion of such phases of our rural situation as "Women in Agriculture"; "The Child on the Farm"; "Rural Recreation." Each one of these might well engage an entire conference and they are intimately related one with the other. (*A summary.*)

KENYON L. BUTTERFIELD, *President.*
HENRY ISRAEL, *Executive Secretary.*

November 3, 1926.

BUSINESS TRANSACTED AT THE CONFERENCE

Thursday Evening Session.

Mrs. Charles Schuttler, Vice-President, presided.

Mr. Walter Campbell of the Springfield Y. M. C. A. College, called attention to the Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the American Country Life Association, and made an appeal for contributions.

Friday Morning, Regular Business Session.

President Butterfield presided.

Mr. Israel presented the annual report of the Board of Directors, which was adopted. This report is printed in brief form on pages 143-145.

Mr. Frame reported that he and Mr. Israel had conferred with the editors of the Standard Farm Papers and that he (Mr. Frame) had worked out a neighborhood score card and had written a series of articles for these papers.

The report was received.

Dr. Brunner presented the following resolution, which was adopted:

That the American Country Life Association express its hearty thanks to the Washington Committee on Arrangements for the excellent preparation made for this Conference, that it particularly send its thanks to those who directed and prepared the various documents and exhibits that have enabled the Conference to start with such a body of fact upon its subject and authorize the President and Secretary of the Association to carry these thanks to the persons involved.

Mr. Montgomery reported for the nominating committee the following nominations for the Board of Directors:

For the one year term: Edmund de S. Brunner, E. L. Morgan, Mrs. Thomas G. Powell, C. C. Taylor, Hugh McRae, Nat T. Frame.

For the two-year term: E. C. Lindeman, Carl S. Vrooman, Miss Mabel Carney, Henry Morgantheau, Jr., S. H. Thompson, W. J. Campbell, and J. B. Reynolds.

For the three-year term: Kenyon L. Butterfield, Charles F. Jenkins, Frank O. Lowden, C. B. Smith, L. J. Taber, Mrs. Charles Schuttler, and Edwin V. O'Hara.

It was voted that the Secretary cast one ballot for all those nominated.

President Butterfield reported that the old Board of Directors had decided to continue publication of the Proceedings and of *Rural America*. He asked for suggestions and instructions, if this decision was not satisfactory. None were expressed.

Mr. Israel presented the financial report for the first nine months of the calendar year, which was received.

Suggestions were made by Mr. Manning of Maine, and Dr. Mumford of Michigan, that State Country Life Associations might be a means of increasing the membership of the Association. Dr. Mumford explained that a beginning had been made in the formation of a Michigan Association, which gave half of the dues collected to the national association.

Dr. Kirkpatrick suggested the organization of local groups, as in Washington.

Dr. Butterfield announced plans for the Tenth Annual Conference, to be held at East Lansing the first week in August, 1927. He stated that the Association's meeting would be one of several large gatherings during Country Life Week. He also reported that a joint committee of the American Country Life Association and of the Farm Economics Association had prepared material for use at the conference, the theme of which might be "Farm Income and Farm Life."

Friday Evening Session.

President Butterfield presided and Professor Sanderson presented the report of the Joint Committee of the American Country Life Association which has been making preparations for the next conference. The report was received.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

Following is a copy of the auditor's report of the financial position of the American Country Life Association as of December 31, 1926, and a statement of income and expenditure for the year 1926:

LYBRAND, ROSS BROS. & MONTGOMERY

March 9, 1927.

Dear Sirs:

In compliance with your request we have audited the books and accounts of the American Country Life Association for the year ended December 31, 1926, and we submit herewith a report of our examination together with a statement of income and expenditures for the year and the financial position of the Association as of December 31, 1926.

BALANCE SHEET

December 31, 1926

Assets		*Liabilities*	
Cash in bank	$ 163.18	Accounts payable	$16,085.90
Revolving fund	750.00	Bank loans payable	5,900.00
Books on hand, at cost	2,618.96		
Accounts receivable	1,250.00	Total liabilities	$21,985.90
Office equipment	800.42	Reserve for International Conference, 1927	2,203.14
		Total deficit 1926, carried over from 1923 and 1924, less surplus of 1925	18,606.48
Total assets	$5,582.56		$ 5,582.56

STATEMENT OF INCOME AND EXPENDITURES

for the year ended December 31, 1926

Income

Membership:		
Renewals	$ 1,674.50	
New	697.94	
Affiliated	80.00	
Contributions:		
Individual	22,195.90	
Russell Sage Foundation	10,000.00	
Magazine subscriptions	202.84	
Book sales	1,123.70	
European trip	37.35	
Miscellaneous income	95.10	
Total income		$36,107.33

Expenditures

Administration:		
Salaries, executive secretary	$ 7,500.00	
Salaries, office	7,474.65	
Rent, New York office	1,352.64	
Printing, stationery and postage	1,211.40	
Telephone and telegraph	317.64	
Traveling expense	1,286.17	
Committee service	46.81	
Interest on bank loans	352.12	
Depreciation on office equipment	104.56	
Miscellaneous expense	232.75	$19,878.74
Membership and finance promotion:		
Counsel fees	$ 2,013.87	
Booklets, mailing service, etc.	13,822.12	15,835.99
Rural America:		
Editorial service	$ 700.00	
Printing, mailing, etc.	3,268.83	3,968.83
Ninth National Conference:		
Printing, etc.	$ 956.59	
Executive committee, traveling	918.67	1,875.26
Books—Proceedings and Handbook:		
Proceedings on hand, January 1, 1926	$ 2,808.28	
Printing and publishing:		
Eighth National Conference Proceedings	2,091.72	
Handbook of Rural Social Resources	775.24	
	$ 5,675.24	
Less, on hand, December 31, 1926	2,618.96	3,056.28
Farm Woman's Conference		379.58
Total expenditures		$44,994.68
Deficit for the year		$ 8,887.35

COMMITTEES OF THE ASSOCIATION

The permanent functioning factor of the American Country Life Association is its system of standing committees. It is the aim of the Association to have specialists appointed to these various committees who will devote attention and study to the subject matter with which each respective committee is concerned. The reports of these committees constitute a continuous critique of the social phases of American country life.

I. Committee on Rural Government and Legislation

(To be appointed)

II. Committee on Rural Organization

Chairman, Walter Burr, Kansas State Agricultural College, Manhattan, Kansas.
Charles J. Galpin, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.
Nat T. Frame, Director of Extension, Morgantown, W. Va.
E. L. Morgan, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
Edwin C. Johnson, Dean of Agricultural College, Pullman, Wash.
Elwood Mead, Department of Interior, Washington, D. C.
Dwight Sanderson, Rural Social Organization, Ithaca, N. Y.

III. Committee on Country Planning

Chairman, Frank A. Waugh, Massachusetts Agricultural College, Amherst, Mass.
John W. Gregg, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.
Arthur W. Cowell, Department of Horticulture, State College, Pa.
George B. Dealey, Manager, "Dallas News," Dallas, Texas.

IV. Committee on Teaching of Rural Sociology

Chairman, John H. Kolb, Department of Economics, College of Agriculture, Madison, Wis.
George H. Von Tungeln, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
Miss Rosamond Root, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
H. A. Bone, Illinois State Normal University, Normal, Ill.
E. S. Bogardus, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.

V. Committee on Recreation and Social Life

Chairman, A. G. Arvold, State College of Agriculture, Fargo, N. D.

VI. Committee on Religious Life and Activities

Chairman (To be appointed)
Edwin L. Earp, Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.
R. A. McGowan, National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D. C.
R. S. Adams, Rural Church Field Worker, Lansdale, Pa.

C. M. McConnell, Board of Home Missions and Church Extension, Methodist Episcopal Church, 740 Rush Street, Chicago, Illinois.
Warren H. Wilson, Presbyterian Board of National Missions, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
A. W. Taylor, 821 Occidental Building, Indianapolis, Indiana.
Edwin V. O'Hara, National Catholic Welfare Conference, Eugene, Oregon.
Albert E. Roberts, National Y. M. C. A., 347 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Miss Anna M. Clark, National Y. W. C. A., 600 Lexington Ave., New York, N. Y.
Malcolm Dana, 287 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
M. R. Zigler, Home Mission Secretary Church of the Brethren, 3435 Van Buren St., Chicago, Illinois.
Theodore B. Manny, Hendrix College, Conway, Arkansas.
Edmund DeS. Brunner, Institute of Social and Religious Research, 370 Seventh Avenue, New York, N. Y.

VII. Committee on Rural Social Work

Chairman, Leroy A. Ramsdell, New York School of Social Work, 105 East 22nd Street, New York, N. Y.
Miss Henrietta Roelofs, National Board Y. W. C. A., 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Mr. Wiley Swift, National Child Labor Committee, 215 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Miss Emma Lundburg, Child Welfare League of America, 130 East 22nd Street, New York, N. Y.
Miss Elizabeth Rogers, 262 Ann Street, Hartford, Conn.
Miss Margaret Sickels, Central Bureau of Social Service, Morristown, N. J.
Miss Gertrude Vaile, Ames, Iowa.
Mr. Burr Blackburn, Georgia State Council of Social Agencies, Atlanta, Ga.
Miss Louise Cottrell, Extension Service, Iowa State University, Iowa City, Iowa.
Mr. J. H. Montgomery, Cooperative Education League of Virginia, Richmond, Va.
Mr. J. B. Gwin, American Red Cross, Washington, D. C.
Miss Elizabeth Alling, 140 Benedict Avenue, Norwalk, Ohio.

State Representatives:

Mrs. Grace Cary, 2 Myrtle Street, Hartford, Conn.
Miss Mary Helen Smith, State Charities Aid Association, 105 East 22nd St., New York, N. Y.
Miss Mame Camp, North Carolina State Board of Public Welfare, Raleigh, North Carolina.
Mr. H. J. Mathews, State Board of Public Welfare, Atlanta, Ga.
Miss Hannah Protzman, 277 East Long Street, Columbus, Ohio.
Miss Evadne Laptad, 1732 Louisiana Street, Lawrence, Kansas.

VIII. Committee on Communication and Transportation

Chairman, George H. Von Tungeln, Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.
E. L. Kirkpatrick, Farm Population and Rural Life Section, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.
John Phelan, Michigan Agricultural College, East Lansing, Mich.
W. E. Garnett, State College of Texas, College Station, Texas.
Mrs. Charles C. Schuttler, Farmington, Mo.

E. S. Bogardus, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.
Miss Florence E. Ward, States Relation Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.
Hermann N. Morse, Presbyterian Board of National Missions, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Henry A. Wallace, "Wallace's Farmer," Des Moines, Iowa.
F. C. Horner, General Motors Corporation, 224 West 57th St., New York, N. Y.
R. E. Plimpton, "Bus Transportation," 10th Avenue and 36th Street, New York, N. Y.

IX. Committee on Rural Leadership Training

Chairman, W. J. Campbell, Y. M. C. A. College, Springfield, Mass.
John Phelan, Michigan Agricultural College, East Lansing, Mich.
Ernest Burnham, State Normal College, Kalamazoo, Mich.
G. Walter Fiske, 278 West College Street, Oberlin, Ohio.
Miss Anna M. Clark, National Y. W. C. A., 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Earl A. Roadman, Department of Rural Leadership, Upper Iowa University, Fayette, Iowa.
A. W. Nolan, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.
John H. Kolb, Department of Economics, College of Agriculture, Madison, Wis.

X. Committee on Investigation of Rural Social Problems

Chairman, Carl C. Taylor, North Carolina State College, Raleigh, N. Carolina.
Hermann N. Morse, Presbyterian Board of National Missions, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. J. Galpin, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.
Warren H. Wilson, Presbyterian Board of National Missions, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

XI. Committee on Rural Education

Chairman, Ernest Burnham, State Normal College, Kalamazoo, Mich.
O. G. Brim, State University, Columbus, Ohio.
Miss Fannie W. Dunn, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
Miss Elizabeth Kelley, Department of Public Instruction, Raleigh, North Carolina.
N. R. Baker, Superintendent of Jefferson County Public Schools, Birmingham, Ala.
Will C. Wood, Superintendent of Education, Sacramento, Calif.
Miss June Emery, Dean of State Normal School, Madison, S. D.
Mrs. Katherine M. Cook, Chief of Division of Rural Education, Federal Bureau of Education, Washington, D. C.
George C. Works, Department of Rural Education, State College of Agriculture, Ithaca, N. Y.
Miss Josephine A. Arnquist, State College of Agriculture, Ames, Iowa.
John H. Kolb, Department of Economics, College of Agriculture, Madison, Wis.

XII. Committee on Health and Sanitation

(To be appointed)

XIII. Committee on Homemaking

Chairman, Miss Ilena M. Bailey, Bureau of Home Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.
Miss Lita Bane, Secretary American Home Economics Association, Washington, D. C.
Miss Grace E. Frysinger, Cooperative Extension Work, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.
Miss Amelia Greenwald, Council of Jewish Women, 132 East 45th Street, New York, N. Y.
Miss Bess Rowe, "The Farmer's Wife," St. Paul, Minn.
Mrs. Jane S. McKimmon, State Home Demonstration Agent, Raleigh, North Carolina.
Miss Harriet Mason, "The Ohio Farmer," Cleveland, Ohio.
Miss Ola Powell, Office of Cooperative Extension Work, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

XIV. Committee on International Aspects of Country Life

Chairman, Kenyon L. Butterfield, Michigan Agricultural College, East Lansing, Mich.
J. R. Howard, 30 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. C. Lindeman, Greystone, High Bridge, N. J.
Mrs. Robert A. Ware, 246 Devonshire Street, Boston, Mass.
Thomas F. Hunt, Berkeley, Calif.
E. C. Branson, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

Date Due

5-5-49			

Library Bureau Cat. no. 1137

WITHDRAWN

T2-DFV-794